CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXIV OCTOBER 1939 *Number 4*

PERSIA AND THE GREEK FRONTIER PROBLEM

A. T. OLMSTEAD

"GREECE and the Persian Wars" is a threadbare subject;[1] "Persia and the Greek Frontier Problem" has at least the virtue of novelty. Such novelty must be found in the point of view, that of a Persian, rather than in any particular access of new source material. It is true that we have today literally thousands of contemporary documents in the various oriental languages, Persian, Elamite, Babylonian, Aramaic, Phoenician, Hebrew, Egyptian, Lycian, Lydian, and that some of these are narratives; their value for the culture history of the Persian Empire and as a background against which we project the events now to be related cannot possibly be overexaggerated, but an extremely small portion throws direct light on the political relations of Persia with Greece. This absence of reference is in itself highly significant. While Persia was undoubtedly the controlling factor of contemporary Greece, the Greeks on the western frontier were for long of small interest to Persian great kings.[2]

Our chief narrative source remains Herodotus, the story eked out by scraps from other Greek writers like Ctesias. But we tend to forget

[1] Bibliography, *CAH*, IV (1926), 613 ff.; of special importance, G. Rawlinson, *Herodotus* (4 vols.; 1861–64); H. Delbrück, *Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege* (1887); G. B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War* (1901), for relation of parties in Greece to Persia.

[2] This article is a preliminary discussion of problems to be developed in the writer's "History of New Testament Times in the Near East." Other preliminary studies of the relations of Persians to Greeks may be found in the writer's "Oriental Imperialism," *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XXIII (1918), 759 ff.; "Darius and His Behistun Inscription," *Amer. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, LV (1938), 392 ff.; *History of Palestine and Syria* (1931), pp. 553 ff.

that Herodotus was born a Persian subject, that his wide travels were possible only through the Persian peace, that after his retirement to Continental Greece he was still in contact with Persian friends, and that he employed Persian sources, written or unwritten. Nor does he show himself violently anti-Persian if naturally he rejoices in Greek successes which had already become legendary. He presents honestly the facts to the best of his ability, and if he has not always detected partisan distortions, his facts generally permit us to correct the interpretation. Our main task is to confront the conventional treatment by present-day writers with his own stated facts.

When in 558 B.C., Cyrus marched west against Croesus of Lydia, Persia was in no sense the mighty power it was soon to become. By the conquest of Media, he had secured only the western half of the Iranian Plateau, by this very expedition he was to add Assyria, western Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, and finally Lydia (557), which was formed into the satrapy of Saparda or Sardis.[3]

Before the final battle with the Lydians, Cyrus had offered terms to the Greek coastal cities, which for long years had been subject to Lydia; the majority refused, but Miletus accepted, and the Persians had learned their first lesson in handling the Greeks—divide and conquer. By right of conquest, title to the former Lydian vassals passed to Cyrus, and the refusal of the Greeks to submit made them automatically rebels. Their position was not improved by their demand that they enjoy the same favored position as under Croesus, and when this demand was naturally refused as coming too late, the fortifying of their cities meant war. The Greeks appealed to Sparta, known to Cyrus as a summoned ally of Croesus which had made no appearance, and to his amazement the great king received an embassy which forbade him to injure any Greek city! Miletus at least was loyal, and when Pactyas, native treasurer of the satrapy, revolted with aid from Greek mercenaries, Apollo of Milesian Branchidae ordered his surrender. Henceforth Apollo was to remain a consistent friend of Persia.

Then came the turn of the rebel Greeks, who fought bravely but without unity and were taken one by one; when Cnidus attempted

[3] Nabu-naid-Cyrus Chronicle, ii, 15 ff.; Herod. i. 74 ff. Data on the satrapies are taken from an unpublished study.

to insure safety by cutting through the isthmus, Apollo of Delphi followed Apollo of Branchidae and forbade the project. Carians, Lycians, and Caunians fought with equal bravery and equal lack of union, others surrendered, and in short order the seacoast was organized as Yauna, Ionia; it was not, however, a regular satrapy but was controlled by the satrap at Sardis. Hellespontine Greeks, on the contrary, were under a satrap, who from Dascylium administered Tyaiy Drayahya, "Those of the Sea."[4]

This brief episode taught the Persians much. They learned that as individuals the Greeks were excellent fighters, worthy incorporation in Persian armies, also that the city-states were incapable of united action and that they would always have friends among them. Best of all friends was Apollo, god of oracles. But the most important discovery was that of the class divisions within the city-states themselves.

Most of the Greek states had long since abandoned kingship for a hereditary nobility of landholders. New economic forces had brought into prominence a new aristocracy of trade-bought wealth, which through the tyrant often supplanted this older aristocracy of birth. While the patriotism of the older nobility was inevitably narrow, men of trade could appreciate opportunities offered by inclusion in a great empire; obviously it was to Persian advantage that Greek cities should be intrusted to tyrants.

Under their tyrants the Greeks remained quiet while Cyrus rapidly expanded his empire. Conquest of eastern Iran gave Cyrus an enormous addition of first-class fighting men and determined the conquest of Babylon, Syria was occupied, the Phoenicians submitted. Henceforth the empire possessed another war fleet, equal at least in numbers and skill to the Greeks should they ever combine in revolt, the Greek traders within the empire now faced the keenest competition from merchant-princes who ruled city-states much like their own. Cambyses rounded out the huge empire by subjugation of Egypt, the Greek "factory" at Naucratis was in his possession, the lucrative Greek trade with the Nile was at his mercy. When Greeks of Cyrene

[4] Herod. i. 152 ff.; Charon Lamps. *Pers.* 1; Aeschyl. *Pers.* 770 ff.; Xenophan. *Parod.* 22; Aristox. 23.

sent in their submission, a good half of the Greek states, certainly the wealthier and more advanced half, was under Persian control.

Suddenly the empire was convulsed by the usurpation of Darius I (521), and the more important of the states recently conquered declared their independence.[5] Aryandes, satrap of Egypt, announced himself ruler, Oroetes of Sardis killed the satrap of neighboring Dascylium, but the Greeks of these satrapies were held loyal to Persia by their tyrants, who took no action even when the most powerful of them all, Polycrates of Samos, was treacherously killed by Oroetes.[6]

The revolts put down and the gold of northwest India added to the imperial resources,[7] Darius was prepared to continue extension of the empire. With the more important half of the Greek states already his, incorporation of the remainder must have appeared inevitable. A court physician, Democedes of Italian Croton, was dispatched from Sidon to make a preliminary survey of the western coasts. Ariaramnes, satrap of Cappadocia, crossed the Black Sea for a reconnaisance of the north shore in preparation for a Scythian expedition. By this expedition, led by the king in person, the Scythians were warned off, Thrace and Macedonia submitted, the European conquests were formed into the satrapy of Skudra, named from the Macedonian town Scydra it has been suggested. Artaphernes, the king's brother, arrived as satrap of Sardis, Otanes captured Byzantium with its command of the straits, Lemnos and Imbros were secured with ships loaned by friendly Lesbos.[8]

The path to Continental Greece was being cleared when in 507 Artaphernes received an embassy which offered direct access to the heart of the desired area. Athens under Cleisthenes was experimenting with a mild democracy which as a matter of course was threatened

[5] Cf. "Darius and His Behistun Inscription," *loc. cit.*

[6] Herod. iii. 120 ff.

[7] This statement has been questioned on the ground that no native gold has been found in India and that it must have been mined in Siberia. However this may be, we should also remember that India has always been a great collecting pool for gold, that Herodotus in his tribute list of the satrapies, iii. 94, taken from a Persian document, assigns India three hundred and sixty talents of gold *dust*, and that apparently this is what the Indians carry on the Persepolis reliefs. Gold dust should indicate alluvial deposits, now presumably worked out, and not gold from ore.

[8] *Ibid.* 136 ff.; iv. 83 ff., 143 f.; v. 26 f.; Ctes. 29. 16 ff.

by ultra-conservative Sparta; Sparta was the declared enemy of Persia, Persian alliance was therefore indicated. Artaphernes received the embassy and demanded the usual tokens of submission, earth and water. The envoys complied and the first contact of Greek democracy and Persian imperialism was made memorable by the promise of the rising democracy to accept Persian vassalage! During the interval public sentiment had changed, the envoys' action was disavowed and Cleisthenes was banished. Two years later, their opponents sent another embassy which begged the satrap not to aid the expelled tyrant Hippias; as might have been expected, they were ordered to restore him under pain of death.[9]

Large numbers of Ionian Greeks had been brought together by the Scythian expedition. Conscious at last of their strength if united but quite failing to realize that they had lost their chance; now that the troubles incident to the accession had been composed, they decided to revolt. Opposition to the tyrants imposed by the Persians had grown, the commercial classes fostered by the tyrants were losing trade to the Phoenicians and to the European Greeks, and the nationalistic landholding aristocracy took advantage of the shift in sentiment. Their leader was Aristagoras, himself tyrant of Miletus, who requested one hundred ships to restore certain Naxian exiles and thus extend Persian rule in the islands. Thus far Miletus had been the most loyal of Greek vassals, but Artaphernes had his suspicions and sent instead two hundred commanded by the king's nephew Megabates and manned largely by non-Greeks; as might have been expected, the Naxians were warned and the project failed.

Aristagoras next summoned the leaders to revive the Ionic League. Only Hecataeus opposed the revolt. When preparing his "World Tour" he had learned at first hand the empire's strength and he listed in order all the nations subject to the great king. His protest went unheeded and it was voted to abolish tyranny; Aristagoras resigned, the other tyrants were killed, imprisoned, or expelled.

[9] Herod. v. 73, 96. There is no attempt here to discuss the various problems connected with Cleisthenes and his constitutional reforms; that the envoys who made the promise of earth and water represented the recalled Cleisthenes is assured by Herodotus, from our study of Perso-Greek relations it is equally obvious that the counterdemand must have been made by their opponents who were therefore in power at that time.

Despite her brave words, Sparta held back once Aristagoras had incautiously displayed his bronze map of the world and had let slip it was three months' journey from the coast to Susa. Argos inquired of Delphian Apollo, and received the expected reply, a threat that for its wickedness Miletus would be destroyed. Athens, conservative once more, met the appeal that Miletus was a daughter-city by voting twenty ships, Eretria five. The small European contingent took part in the capture of Sardis, then retreated from the burning city, and was recalled to meet the war with Aegina; Persian diplomacy had done its work. The naval war was transferred to Cyprus, the first of many struggles between Phoenician vassal city-states and their Greek rivals on the island. Persia quickly recovered Cyprus, city after city in western Asia Minor was captured or submitted, when Lade was fought (494) half the Ionian states had already made their peace. Lade was a complete rout, all the former subject states were regained, Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos were new acquisitions.[10]

Hecataeus had been justified, the historian was the one man to make peace with the satrap. Artaphernes professed himself quite willing to forget the wrongs he had suffered in the rebellion; he would restore to the rebel states their laws, but at a price to be set at a meeting of the Ionian deputies. Hitherto they had been allowed a considerable degree of autonomy, now they were brought more effectively into the satrapial organization. Private war between the states must be abandoned, they must submit to arbitration. Persia had followed Assyria in taking a census for purposes of taxation; now such a census was imposed on Yauna Tyaiy Ushkahya, "Ionia of the Dry Land," as opposed to "Ionia of the Sea." The satrapy was measured in parasangs, the "double-hour march" of the Assyrians; the tribute was fixed at approximately the pre-war level, though punishment of the revolting states by loss of considerable tracts of land increased the pressure on those which were left. A lion weight of a Euboeic talent, inscribed in Aramaic "exact according to the satrapy of the king," has been found at Abydos to witness the new tax administration.[11]

Mardonius, son of Gobryas, and just become son-in-law of the king,

[10] *Ibid.* 30 ff., 96 ff., 102 ff.; vi. 1 ff.; Charon Lampsc. *Pers.* 2.

[11] *CIS*, Pars II, No. 108.

superseded the officers at the seat of war. He announced a new policy. Darius had observed the tendency in some of the Greek states of Asia to experiment with a primitive democracy. Adherents of Cleisthenes had promised earth and water, their opponents had aided Ionian rebels. When that aid had brought threats of Persian revenge, the enemies of the present conservative government, the friends of the expelled tyrant Hippias and the members of the young democracy, had shown their teeth by fining the poet Phrynichus for staging a tragedy on the fall of Miletus. Darius therefore instructed Mardonius to reorganize the recovered Greek states as democracies. For the first time in history democracy had conquered a large and important section of the Greek world and the sturdy infant nestled under the protecting aegis of a "barbarian" monarchy.[12]

The hint was not lost on European Greece, where in a goodly number of states democratic factions were rising into prominence and might be expected to welcome the liberator from the hated conservatives. Furthermore, Greek cities in Asia would remain quiet only if freed from the constant temptation offered by independent kinsmen across the seas, who were ready to sympathize with, if not always prepared to assist, conservative anti-Persian reaction. Once and for all to destroy hope of outside aid, the "hot trail" of the invaders must be followed back.

Mardonius continued the plan of slow penetration from the north under protection of the fleet. Thasos fell to the navy, Macedonia again recognized Persian overlordship, but these successes were counterbalanced by loss of half the ships off Mount Athos and by a serious defeat at the hands of the Bryges, and Mardonius was recalled (492). Hitherto Persian strategy and diplomacy had been virtually without flaw, now began that series of blunders which was to bring ultimate disaster.

The first mistake was to abandon, for a purely temporary setback, the policy of slow penetration from the north. Instead, it was decided to send a fleet directly across the Aegean and to punish the chief offenders in the Ionic revolt, Athens and Eretria. At first there was no indication that a blunder had been committed. The heralds sent

[12] Phrynichus 720 f. (Nauck); Herod. vi. 42 f.; Diod. x. 25. 2; cf. my article, "Oriental Imperialism," *op. cit.*, p. 760.

out to the Greek mainland with the usual demand for earth and water met with conspicuous success. To be sure, at Sparta and Athens the heralds were killed, but almost without exception the other states furnished the usual symbols of bondage. Darius added to his lists another satrapy, Yauna Takabara, "Ionians who bear shields on their heads" as the Akkadian version translates; perhaps the broad petasos hat is meant.[13] Among these accessions was Aegina, which once before had done Persia good service by starting the war which recalled Athenian ships from Asia; Athens complained to Sparta whose king Cleomenes demanded intervention; when his colleague Demaratus protested, he was deposed and like Hippias took refuge with Darius.[14]

The expedition began auspiciously. Commanded by Datis the Mede and the king's nephew, the younger Artaphernes, the fleet occupied and burned Naxos. The Delians fled to Tenos but the Persians begged them to return and offered frankincense and a gold collar to their good friend Apollo.[15] After a six days' investment Eretria was betrayed by a friendly citizen.

Datis might well hope that Athens would likewise be handed over by friends, either the partisans of the former tyrant Hippias, now with the army, or by the democratic leaders, the Alcmaeonidae. These well-grounded hopes were dashed by a second stupid blunder, the destruction of Eretria and the "netting" of the inhabitants; neither democrat nor man of trade could behold unmoved the burning of the beloved city. When therefore Datis landed on the Marathon plain, whose inhabitants were supposed to be friendly, he found the whole Athenian levy drawn up to meet him. After a delay which spoke only too eloquently of still divided counsels, Miltiades attacked and won the battle. Datis yet hoped that Athens would surrender if the fleet arrived while the army was absent, and the Alcmaeonidae actually did signal by shield from Cape Sunium, but the army hurried back in time. Once convinced there was no longer a chance of betrayal by their partisans, the disappointed Persians sailed home. The Eretrians were deported to Ardericca in Cissia, the land of the earlier Kash-

[13] For the hat as symbol of the west to eastern thought, cf. my article "Wearing the Hat," *Amer. Jour. Theology*, XXIV (1920), 94 ff.

[14] Herod. vi. 44 ff.; Charon Lampsc. *Pers.* 3; Xenophon *Hell.* iii. 1. 6.

[15] Lindos Chronicle, C, 65 ff.; D, 1 ff.

shites, and there in the first century of our era Apollonius of Tyana found them still holding in remembrance their earlier home and speaking their ancestral language.[16]

To Darius, Marathon was only a temporary setback in a policy of steady frontier advance. A larger army was all that was needed to crush opposition and to incorporate the remaining Greeks into the empire. Preparation for a renewal of this troublesome frontier war was begun and of course this demanded fresh taxes. In June, 486, Nabu-ittanu discovered from Shatamaksu and Nubagaza, the major domo, that he must pay a new toll on the barley, wheat, and mustard he was bringing through the storehouse on a Babylonian canal. They told him: "It was determined, before the judge it was recorded." "According to the king's law," the same Persian word is used as in the Artaxerxes decree in Ezra, "the toll for the king's house he shall give."[17]

Fresh additions to an already increased tax burden led Egypt to revolt in this same year, 486. A Persian law decreed that a successor must be chosen before the king departed for war. Ariobarzanes was eldest of three sons by a daughter of Gobryas; he may be the "king's son of Elam," forced labor for whom is commuted by a money payment in 507 and for whom a palace was constructed at Babylon in 498.[18] Partisans of Xerxes, eldest of four sons by Atossa, daughter of Cyrus, contested his claim, and a bitter palace quarrel ensued. As purple born and as descendant of the empire's founder, Xerxes was naturally chosen. New evidence has been found in new inscriptions of Xerxes, further evidence may be seen in the many reliefs at Persepolis, the best those recently excavated by the Oriental Institute, where Xerxes stands dutifully behind his father seated on the throne.[19]

Before Darius could put down the Egyptian rebellion, he died, about October 15, 484.[20] Xerxes succeeded, and the rebellion was put

[16] Simonides 89 f., 117; Herod. vi. 94 ff., 119; Ctes. 29. 18; Plato *Menex.* 240; *Ins.* 9, 13; Curt. iv. 12. 11; Philostrat. *Vit. Apollon.* i. 23 f.

[17] *Vorderasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, III, No. 159.

[18] J. Strassmaier, *Darius*, No. 411; *Vorderasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, III, No. 136.

[19] Herod. vii. 1 ff.; i. 209; Ctes. 29. 19 f.; Marmor Parium A, 49; E. Herzfeld, *A New Inscription of Xerxes from Persepolis* (1932); *Altpersische Inschriften* (1938), pp. 35 ff.; Erich Schmidt, *The Treasury of Persepolis* (1939), pp. 21 ff.

[20] Cf. my "Darius and His Behistun Inscription, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

down in his second year, 483.[21] He was more interested in completing the magnificent structures begun by his father on the Persepolis terrace than in testing by European adventures the formidable army machine his father had built up; he was urged on by his cousin Mardonius, ambitious to be made satrap of newly won territories, and by exiled Athenians who even hired an oracle-monger. The kings of Thessaly invited his appearance. Reluctantly Xerxes prepared to continue his father's policy of expansion on the western frontier.

Direct attack across the Aegean had failed and Xerxes wisely returned to the former policy of gradual advance by land, the army supported by the fleet. To avoid another shipwreck at Athos, a canal was dug through the isthmus. The entire navy was to be utilized and half the regular troops, three of the six army corps, each about sixty thousand strong.

While the expeditionary force wintered at Sardis, the threatened Greeks vainly endeavored to form an effective alliance. As might have been expected, appeal to the Delphic Oracle brought only discouragement. Apollo bade the Athenians escape to earth's end. A second oracle predicted occupation of all Attica and promised safety only in the wooden walls of the ships. Argos, suspected of inviting Persian intervention after defeat by Sparta, was ordered by Apollo to sit still. Corcyra's ships were "detained" by contrary winds. Gelo of Syracuse promised much and sent three small boats to watch the outcome. Theognis of Megara was typical of many when he urged revelry without fear of a war with the Medes. Awake at last to his danger, he could only appeal to the god—Apollo of all divinities!—for protection against the wanton host of the Medes; he was afraid when he saw the lack of sense and the folk-destroying internal struggles of the Greeks.[22]

Still more affrighting was the action of Xerxes when the allied spies were caught at Sardis; full of confidence, he ordered them shown the whole vast array and then released them to report home. At the first sign of spring, 480, he marched to the Troad and climbed the citadel of Priam to sacrifice to the local Athena while Magi poured libations

[21] J. Couyet and P. Montet, *Les Inscriptions du Oaudi Hammamat* (1912), p. 52; G. Posener, *La première domination Perse en Egypte* (1936), p. 120.

[22] Theognis 757 ff., 773 ff.; Herod. vii. 22 ff., 140 ff.; Hellanicus *Pers.* ii. 61 (Jacoby).

to the spirits of those who had died in defense of Troy. Thus Xerxes announced himself protagonist of the Orient in the new Trojan War.[23]

Assembled at the Corinthian Isthmus, which the Peloponnesian members of the alliance had already decided was the only tenable line of defense, the allies received a Thessalian request for aid in guarding the Olympus Pass. Ten thousand heavy-armed infantry, supported by a naval force, occupied the Vale of Tempe and were reinforced by Thessalian cavalry, representatives of the conservatives, the commons were as naturally pro-Persian. Alexander of Macedonia did good service for his Persian master by urging the allies not to remain and be trampled by the king's host and soon they hurried home to the Isthmus.[24]

The Hellespont was crossed by bridges constructed by a Greek, and the combined land and naval forces marched south without opposition. On the way Xerxes was met by heralds bringing earth and water from abandoned Thessaly, Locri, and all Boeotia except Plataea and Thespiae, for it was already plain that the allies from the Peloponnese had no intention of offering serious opposition north of the Isthmus.[25]

Victory appeared certain to the Persians. Not only did they control all the Greeks of Asia and Africa whose ships were included in their navy, already half the European Greeks had submitted and there remained to be subdued only a few recalcitrant states in the Peloponnese since it was now clear that all north of the Isthmus was to be abandoned. Apollo of Delphi was their loyal friend. Athens, ruled by the democracy under Themistocles, would certainly go over to democracy's patron once the Peloponnesians retired behind the Isthmus. With the Athenian fleet safely Persian, the Isthmus wall could be turned, Argos would declare itself openly, a wedge would be driven between Sparta and Corinth, each would be defeated when fighting alone.

Nor was the picture changed as the march southward was resumed. Loss of Thessaly did bring Leonidas north as far as Thermopylae with three hundred Spartans and a few allied contingents, but the small

[23] Herod. vii. 42 ff.

[24] *Ibid.* 172 ff.

[25] Aeschyl. *Pers.* 65 ff., 722 ff.; Herod. vii. 33 ff.

number loudly proclaimed that only rear-guard skirmishes were intended to delay, not to stop the advance until the Isthmus wall was complete. The fleet took its position near Artemisium but retired to the narrower Euripus once the Persian navy was sighted. Even the loss of many Persian ships in a sudden gale did not encourage Leonidas, who was prepared for immediate retirement; only the indignant protests of the Locrians and Phocians compelled him to remain to meet a hero's death and to win posthumous fame.[26] The opening of Thermopylae more than canceled any advantage won by the first allied attack on the divided Persian fleet, in the second battle at Artemisium the tide had already turned, the Egyptians had taken five ships, half the Athenian ships had been disabled when news of Thermopylae arrived and the whole naval force retreated from a position become untenable.

Phocis was ravaged, the army entered Boeotia, held safely for them by Alexander of Macedon. A flying column took the road to Delphi, to reward Apollo for his pro-Persian oracles and to support his further efforts, we should have supposed, to loot the treasures his priests later explained with some plausibility. As he had promised, the god protected his own, he thundered and hurled down cliffs on the barbarians who fled with great slaughter; such at least was the Delphic version—after the defeat of Persia.[27]

At Theban urging, Xerxes burned Thespiae and Plataea and entered Attica which he found deserted, for the allied fleet had paused at Salamis only to evacuate the civilian population. A few zealots barred the Acropolis, trusting to Apollo's ambiguous oracle; once the terms offered by the followers of Hippias were refused, the Acropolis was taken and burned and the failure at Marathon was redeemed. The Persian fleet anchored off Phalerum and panic seized the allies. Salamis was a veritable trap and all but the interested Athenians, Aeginetans, and Megarians were rightly anxious to escape before the trap was sprung. Only the threat of Themistocles to sail off with his whole fleet and the knowledge that the democratic leader was quite capable of carrying out his threat drove the Spartan admiral Eurybiades to command preparation for battle.

[26] Herod. vii. 207.

[27] Simonides 12 ff.; Herod. viii. 1 ff.

At the Persian council, only the lady tyrant of Halicarnassus, Artemisia, opposed immediate attack. Victory seemed to be within their grasp. Sparta had abandoned one ally after another, and the alacrity with which each had made terms proclaimed loudly the strong pro-Persian sentiment hitherto repressed. Athenian ships were manned by the commons and captained by the leader of the democratic faction; flouted at every turn by the Peloponnesians, he should now be prepared to return to the normal policy of his party, since it was amply clear that the Peloponnesians had determined to leave the Athenians in the lurch.

The awaited message was quickly received. Themistocles declared himself the king's friend who desired his success.[28] The Greeks were frightened and ready to flee, let the king prevent their escape; dissensions had broken out and soon the pro-Persians would fall upon the king's enemies. There was no reason for Xerxes to doubt these protestations of loyalty.

Yet both letter and decision of immediate attack were mistakes. Had Xerxes taken no action at all, the few remaining allies would have retired to the Isthmus. The Athenians, Megarians, and Aeginetans would have been compelled to accept terms. With their aid the Isthmus wall would have been outflanked and there would have remained only the mopping up. Quite as effective was the actual procedure of Xerxes. The eastern exits were blocked by a triple line of ships, the Egyptians, "marsh dwellers, skillful rowers of galleys" with two hundred ships sailed to block the western. Now the whole allied naval force was bottled up and could be left for exhaustion of supplies and for mutual recriminations to do their work, either to compel surrender or the attempt to break the encirclement with the consequent opportunity to pick off the ships as they emerged. On the basis of the actual situation, the Persians were entirely justified in dispatching that very night their infantry and cavalry to fight the decisive battle at the Isthmus.

Unfortunately for Persia, Xerxes was not content to leave well enough alone; he must win a spectacular victory, and he therefore

[28] The term was designedly equivocal, it might imply friend of the king in the ordinary sense, it hinted Themistocles would expect as reward the title King's Friend, the highest honor at court.

ordered a direct attack on men sullen because they had been allowed to be entrapped and now fighting desperately for escape. At first the assault was a success, the Ionian Greeks badly worsted the Spartans, but later the Aeginetans and then the Athenians broke through and attacked in their turn. Against an allied loss of forty ships, the Persians lost two hundred, a third of their naval strength.

Taken by itself, Salamis was a check to the Persian frontier advance and nothing more. None of the recently acquired territory was lost, the army was intact, the fleet was still powerful and needed only reorganization. The allies, to be sure, had been encouraged by an unexpected victory, but they were reduced in numbers and the next year should see them conquered. What made Salamis important was not the victory itself but its effect on the mind of Xerxes. Although he and no one else was responsible for the defeat by ordering an offensive when a simple blockade would have been effective, he completely lost his head and executed the Phoenician captains for alleged cowardice; incensed by their maltreatment, the Phoenicians returned home and were followed by the Egyptians. It was this justified desertion and not the defeat at Salamis which left the Aegean wide open to the allied fleet and permitted the truly decisive operations of the next year.

In a very real sense Salamis was actually a Persian blessing. Discouraged by his fiasco, Xerxes hurried off to Sardis, where he spent the next year keeping watch over Ionia. Direct conduct of the European campaign was transferred to the seasoned campaigner Mardonius, who retained for himself only one army division, composed of Immortals, Persians, Medes, Sacae, Bactrians, and Indians, a force almost exclusively Iranian and so of the best fighting material. Even thus reduced, it was superior in numbers to the allies, and it was supported by half the troops of Continental Greece. A second army under Artabazus, son of Pharnaces, guarded the long seaboard route by which alone supplies could be forwarded, a third under Tigranes held Ionia quiet.[29]

Potidaea revolted; Olynthus threatened to follow its example, but

[29] Simonides 91, 163 ff.; Aeschyl. *Pers.* 302 ff.; Herod. viii. 40 ff., 113; Ctes. 29. 26 ff.; Timotheus *Persae* 19; Ephor. 188 (Jacoby); Aristodemus 1 (Jacoby); Diod. xi. 17 ff.; Plut. *Themistocles* 12 ff.

Artabazus took the city and handed over the ruins to the Chalcidians. Friends of Persia led a detachment under the walls of Potidaea at ebb tide, but the tide turned too soon and those who were not drowned were slaughtered from boats.[30]

From his winter camp in Thessaly, Mardonius sent the Athenian proxenos, Alexander of Macedon, to offer complete forgivenness, rebuilding of the temples, restoration of territory with any lands additional which they might desire, and equal alliance as a free city. Such generous terms must have appealed strongly to the poorer classes, for whom new invasion could only mean new miseries and the loss of their few remaining possessions. But the democracy had lost control. Themistocles had admittedly written a letter to the great king urging him to attack at Salamis; though now he maintained that he had done it in subtlety, he was not believed. After his exile he once more claimed that he had acted as Persia's friend; this time he *was* believed and was richly rewarded by Artaxerxes, Xerxes' son! The reaction had given power to the conservatives who replied that Athens would make no peace.[31]

Mardonius was advised by the Thebans to remain in Boeotia and win over the recalcitrant Greeks through bribes to their leaders. It was sound advice, based on intimate knowledge of their own ethnic character, and Mardonius' refusal to accept it was another in the chain of Persian blunders. Ten months after the first inroad, Athens fell again into his hands, and once more failure of the Peloponnesians to give adequate support drove the citizens to take refuge on Salamis or on their ships. Mardonius repeated his proposals in hope that his presence with an army might enable his friends to force compliance, but the man who merely urged consideration was stoned. Yet there was still hope for Mardonius. As usual, the Spartans were "celebrating a feast"; the Isthmus wall was complete and could be held, they fatuously imagined, even against the Athenian fleet. Even after the victory of Salamis, it appeared, the inability of Sparta to understand the most elementary factors of the situation would drive Athens, despite the conservatives, into the Persian alliance. Finally the disillusioned Athenian ambassadors told Sparta this was exactly what

[30] Herod. viii. 126 ff. [31] *Ibid.* 136, 140 ff.

they were compelled to do. To their amazement the envoys learned that at last a Tegean had convinced the Spartans of their utter folly and that troops were already on the way. At the very last second, fortune had again snatched victory from the Persians.

Friendly Argives relayed the information to Mardonius, who had hitherto refrained from plundering Athens in the well-grounded hope that Spartan procrastination, if not actual disloyalty to an ally, would force Athens to come to terms. Once more disappointed, he again burned Athens and withdrew to Boeotia, where, with Thebes as a base, he could secure adequate supplies. Trees were cut down to construct a stockade over a mile square and Mardonius awaited the allied moves.

The allied forces advanced through Attica and timidly encamped on the north slopes of Cithaeron, opposite the Persians on the Aesopus. Immediately squadron after squadron of cavalry charged the Megarians on the low ground which constituted the weakest part of the line in hope of breaking through to the pass and cutting off supplies. Athenian reinforcements came up and the attack was beaten off. Encouraged, the allies then descended to the lower slopes where encampment was easier and where there was water, the Persians moved up to meet them.

Again Mardonius was advised, this time by Artabazus, to retire and employ bribery, again the general mistakenly refused the advice. The position of the allies was already desperate. They suffered incessant cavalry raids, one of which closed the passes and the road home to the Peloponnese and captured a much-needed provision train. Food was scant, the fountain of Gargapha was choked, the men suffered from thirst. The generals decided to retire at nightfall. Their retirement was made in disorder. The main body lost their way, a stubborn captain delayed the Spartans, who at dawn were drawn up in a thoroughly untenable position. Had the allies been permitted to withdraw unmolested, the coalition would undoubtedly have broken up, the Athenians would have made terms, the Peloponnesians would have retreated to the Isthmus, and the individual states would have been subjugated in detail.

Once more the end of the war was in sight. Once more a Persian commander underestimated the fighting ability of the individual

Greek, backed against a mountain wall. Once more the general was lured by hope of an immediate and spectacular victory and threw away the certain advantages of a dilatory policy. At that, the battle was fiercely contested. From their line of wicker shields[32] the Persian archers poured showers of arrows on the Spartans who were compelled to ask aid from the Athenians; when the Athenians started to the rescue, they were stopped by the Medizing Greeks. Even when the Tegeans, followed by the Spartans, broke down the wicker wall, the Persians fought on, snapping off the spears with their bare hands. Then Mardonius made his last and fatal mistake, he entered the battle in person and was slain. Deprived of their leader, it was only a matter of hours before the stockaded camp was taken and the Persians slaughtered without mercy.[33] Pausanias was a national hero; no one dreamed that before another year was passed he would be plotting to betray his fellow-Greeks for the empty honor of a son-in-law to the Persian king.[34]

Like the earlier battles, Plataea by itself was not decisive. But one of the Persian armies had entered the battle, a second army of equal size was close by. Yet instead of throwing fresh troops upon the battle-weary allies and sweeping them rapidly to the southernmost tip of the Peloponnese, Artabazus retired and the war in Europe was ended. The reason was that Artabazus had heard news from Asia.

In the spring of 479 a new allied fleet had been made ready. The Athenian contingent was under Xanthippus, for his fame as the victor of Salamis had not saved Themistocles from the suspicion of planned betrayal which had aided the conservative reaction. At first the allied captains feared to sail beyond Delos, even when offered the opportunity of deposing the Samian tyrant. Half the Persian fleet was still available, though in large part Ionian and shaken in its loyalty by Salamis. Under Mardontes, son of Bagaeus, Artayntes, son of Artachaeus, and his nephew Ithamitres, it ventured from its winter quarters at Cyme as far as Samos. The allies plucked up courage to

[32] Note the large number of wicker shields in the lists of military supplies on contemporary Elamite tablets from Susa, V. Scheil, *Actes juridiques susiens* (1930–33).

[33] Simonides 92; Aeschyl. *Pers.* 80 ff.; Herod. ix. 1 ff.

[34] Cf. the writer's "A Persian Letter in Thucydides," *Amer. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, XLIX (1933), 156 ff.

visit the island and the Persians withdrew; the still dissatisfied Phoenicians were permitted to return home, the others beached their ships on Cape Mycale, where they formed a stockade of stones and tree trunks surrounded by a deep trench and under the protection of the third army commanded by Tigranes.

A herald from the allies summoned the Ionians to revolt and the suspicious Persians disarmed the Samians. The Milesians, deeply incensed by the disclosure of the treasures of Didymaean Apollo to their Persian masters, were sent off on pretense of guarding the trails. Then the allies attacked; after a desperate resistance, the Athenians broke the wicker wall and followed their fleeing opponents into the stockade. While their other subjects fled and the Ionians turned against them, the Iranians died almost to the last man and with them Mardontes and Tigranes. Stockade and ships were burned.[35] By their own request the Milesians who had betrayed Didymaean Apollo were settled in Sogdiana, where they built a new Branchidae, and the oracle of Apollo became silent.[36]

Although the allies did not at once realize it, Mycale and not Plataea was the decisive battle. Two of the six Persian armies had been destroyed, a third must abandon Europe to guard disaffected western Asia. Truly the allies might say that the gods had fought for them; the war had been lost by repeated military and diplomatic blunders on the part of the Persians, it had not been won by timid, incompetent, or disloyal allied commanders. But victory it was and a new phase of Perso-Greek relations was initiated.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[35] Herod. ix. 90 ff.

[36] Strab. xi. 11. 4; xvii. 1. 43; Curt. vii. 5. 28.

THE LOGOS OF HERACLITUS

EDWIN L. MINAR, JR.

IT IS strange that discussions of the sense of Heraclitus' λόγος have not taken more account of the history of the word and the development of its meanings. It may be well, before passing to a detailed consideration of Heraclitus' usage, to mention a few fundamental characteristics of this development.

The word λόγος is simply the verbal noun from λέγω, which means primarily "gather, collect," as appears clearly from the cognates collected by Walde-Pokorny. The sequence of development is "sammle, lese zusammen, zähle, rede, sage (vgl. z. Bed. engl. *to tell*, ... dt. zählen)."[1] This appears also in the Latin *lego*, *legio*, Greek συλλογή, etc. Consistently, the principal senses of the verb as listed by Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lexicon* (new edition) are (1) "pick up, gather, choose"; (2) "count"; and (3) "say, speak." The third of these, which in classical Greek is most prominent, does not occur in Homer. The first occurrence is Hes. *Theog.* 27. Some examples are found in Homer for the second classification, but in the significance of "recount," "tell over." In a sense derived from λέγω as "say, speak," λόγος is found in Homer in the plural—*Il.* xv. 393: τὸν ἔτερπε λόγοις; *Od.* i. 56: αἱμύλιοι λόγοι.

In the former editions of Liddell and Scott's lexicon the meanings of λόγος were listed under the heads *oratio* and *ratio*, and little was done to clear up the ambiguities in the Greek and Latin words or in the English words commonly used to translate them. The new edition has a new classification based to a greater extent on the historical development of the word; and our survey may follow generally this new system.

I. As might be expected, we find that the primary significance of λόγος is "computation, reckoning." It can mean a money account, or be used more generally as in Hdt. viii. 100: δόντας λόγον τῶν ἐποίησαν (where "render account" means "be punished"). It can mean "meas-

[1] Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* (1927) II, 422; cf. also Boisacq, *Dict. etym. de la langue grecque*[3] (1938), *s.v.* λέγω.

ure, tale," as in Hdt. iii. 99: *ἐς τούτου* (*sc.* *γήραος*) *λόγον ἀπικνέονται* (cf. "the tale of years"). It is here that Liddell and Scott list Heraclitus frag. 31: *θάλασσα .... μετρέεται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ὁκοῖος, κτλ.*, and frag. 115: *ψυχῆς ἐστι λόγος, κτλ.* It is significant that the meaning "esteem," "value" is listed here in the new edition and that Her. frag. 39 *οὗ πλείω λόγος* ("who is of more worth") is cited. Diels translated this "von dem mehr die Rede ist" and it is printed under the heading "Ruf" in *Vors.*[5], III (*Wortindex*), 258*b*8.

II. Another series of passages is grouped under the closely related significance of "relation, correspondence, proportion." There is an example from Theognis (418, 1164) referring to the proportion of gold to lead, and a few from Aeschylus, Herodotus, Hippocrates, and others; then a group of passages in which the word is to be translated "ratio" or "proportion" in the mathematical sense. There are many instances of this in the Pythagorean literature.

III. Closely related to the idea of a reckoning or account is that of an "explanation"; and this is one of the most important and comprehensive headings in the article. The word *λόγος* can denote an explanation in any one of a number of senses. First, it can be a plea, pretext, or ground.[2] It can be the statement of a theory, an argument. It is clearly so in Parmenides frag. 8, l. 50 (cf. also Democritus frag. 7, Pl. *Phaedo* 62*d*, etc.). It seems much preferable to explain Her. frag. 50 (*οὐκ ἐμοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου ἀκούσαντας*) in this way than to translate with Diels "nicht mich, sondern das Wort" ("—den Sinn," Kranz); and likewise, in frag. 108 (*ὁκόσων λόγους ἤκουσα*), where Diels again gives "Worte" and Burnet "discourses." Here are listed also various titles. The *λόγος* of Her. frag. 72 (*ᾧ μάλιστα διηνεκῶς ὁμιλοῦσι λόγῳ*) has been translated "law, rule of conduct." Heraclitus may have meant something similar to "law," but how the phrase "rule of conduct" fits this context is difficult to understand.[3] Through "explanation" *λόγος* sometimes means "thesis" or "hypothesis" in Plato and Aristotle; and in a number of authors it can be construed as "reason, ground." It is here that Liddell and Scott place the important phrase in Her. frag. 1, *κατὰ τὸν λόγον τόνδε*,[4] and the difficult frag. 45, *οὕτω βαθὺν λόγον ἔχει*

[2] See Aesch. *Cho.* 515, Soph. *Phil.* 731, *O.C.* 762, *O.T.* 657, etc.

[3] The parallel with Democritus frag. 53 *ζῶσι κατὰ λόγον* is not convincing.

[4] It seems more likely that *λόγος* here means "doctrine"; it refers clearly to the first *λόγος* (*τοῦ δὲ λόγου τοῦδ' ἐόντος, κτλ.*). Cf. A. Busse, "Der Wortsinn von *λόγος* bei Heraklit," *Rh.M.*, LXXV (1926), 204.

(*sc.* ἡ ψυχή). Compare also Leucippus frag. 2: ἐκ λόγου (opp. μάτην). As explanation, a λόγος may also be a "formula," or kind of definition (in a broad sense). The formula gives an account of the thing to which it applies. Plato (*Rep.* vi. 497*c*) speaks of the λόγος τῆς πολιτείας, and (*Phaedrus* 245*e*) of the οὐσία τε καὶ λόγος of the soul. Aristotle's statement *Top.* 102*a*5 is interesting: πᾶς ὁρισμὸς λόγος τίς ἐστι.

The last division under the general heading of "explanation" is "reason, law, exhibited in the world-process." The only examples of this usage, often supposed to explain many of the fragments of Heraclitus, are a doubtful passage of Epicharmus (frag. 2 Diels), Plato *Rep.* vi. 500*c* (κόσμῳ πάντα καὶ κατὰ λόγον ἔχοντα), and instances from the Stoic and Neo-Platonic literature. To Plotinus and the Neo-Platonists it meant "regulative and formative forces, derived from the intelligible and operative in the sensible universe." It is doubtful whether a trace of this idea can be found in Heraclitus.

IV. Next are considered a number of passages in most of which the conventional translation of λόγος would be "reason." They are thought by the editors of the lexicon to reflect "inward debate of the soul," thinking being treated as primarily reasoning. One endeavors to "give account" to himself. Thus *oratio* is throughout subordinated to *ratio*. The only Heraclitean fragment classified here is 2: τοῦ δὲ λόγου ἐόντος ξυνοῦ, ζώουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἰδίαν ἔχοντες φρόνησιν. Though reasoning is common to all men (i.e., open to all), they live as though they had private insight. It will be seen later that in this passage λόγος probably implies more than that.

Of the earlier passages cited, none seems to show the meaning "reflection." For example, in Anaxagoras frag. 7 (μὴ εἰδέναι . . . . μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἔργῳ) we can perhaps translate "neither by calculation nor through experience." However, this meaning emerges in Plato and Aristotle along with the development of the mind-body and soul-intellect dichotomies.

"Reason as a faculty" is found in pseudo-Epicharmus 256 (frag. 57 Diels), Plato, and the Stoics. Naturally, when Sextus Empiricus speaks of the λόγος in Heraclitus in opposition to αἴσθησις, he is not using Heraclitean language.

The λόγος can also indicate (V) a narrative, oration, etc., or (VI) simply verbal expression or utterance, often contrasted with ἔργον. In Her. frag. 87, λόγος probably means "rumor."

The other main divisions do not specially concern us. They represent usages which are derived or late and mostly unphilosophical (VII, a particular utterance; VIII, subject matter; IX, expression, speech regarded formally; and X, the Word or Wisdom of God).

It will be seen from this brief survey that the fundamental idea of λόγος is that of *an accounting*, and that this idea is retained throughout the early history of the word at least as an undertone. At an early period "account" in the sense related to "count" passes into the sense related to "recount" ("explain, narrate"). But the λόγος is always at least "verbal expression" and never simply "word." Gradually, the simple discrepancy reflected in the opposition between λόγος and ἔργον develops into an idea of the separation of λόγος and ὑποκείμενον, and we have the emergence of an epistemological usage of the word.[5]

With the beginning of rhetorical thought, there is increasing emphasis on the word as an organ of persuasion. It is sufficient to mention the attitude of the Sophists in regard to the power and importance of speech.

Besides the few Heraclitean fragments in which λόγος has the sense of "expression" or the like, there are a number, much harder to interpret, in which it obviously has a more general significance. Heraclitus speaks of a power which pilots the world,[6] and the λόγος has been thought to be simply equivalent to this. Sometimes, Heraclitus seems to identify it loosely with the gods and to attribute to it some of the elements of personality.[7] It is dangerous however to overemphasize this fact, because Heraclitus was much more interested in the philosophy of natural process than in theology as such. His expressions about the gods and the divine are in part rationalistic and opposed to the spirit of traditional religious conceptions,[8] in part poetic and general, clothing in theological language ideas which are in essence entirely secular.[9] Thus the power which pilots the world cannot be identified

[5] Cf. *Vors.*[5] 82 (Gorgias) B 3, II, 282.20 ff.

[6] Frag. 41: *εἶναι γὰρ ἓν τὸ σοφόν, ἐπίστασθαι γνώμην, ὁτέη ἐκυβέρνησε πάντα διὰ πάντων.* Cf. also his expressions regarding the divine law which "nourishes" all human laws (114), etc. However, it should be noted that frag. 41 is to be interpreted in connection with the preceding one, and the emphasis is on the contrast between *πολυμαθίη* and *ἓν τὸ σοφόν* (cf. also frag. 108).

[7] Zeller (*Ph. d. Gr.* I[5], 2, 668, n. 1; 670, n. 3) exaggerates this aspect. Some of the passages he cites are quite irrelevant.

[8] E.g., 5, 14, 15, 30, 53, 67, 119.

[9] E.g., 35, 78, 79, 102, 114.

one for one with the λόγος. It is uncritical to say, as Zeller does (p. 670), that "alle diese Begriffe [*sc.* divinity, harmony, divine law, *dike,* necessity, wisdom, Logos, Zeus, aeon] bezeichnen bei Heraklit ein und dasselbe."

In dealing with the λόγος of Heraclitus, the commentators have generally distinguished it sharply from the Stoic Logos. At the same time, however, the λόγος of Heraclitus was taken as model by the Stoics (doubtless in a form already modified by the interpretation of the Heracliteans), and modern ways of thinking are formed so largely by Stoicism, and, more broadly, Platonism, that it is difficult not to see Heraclitus as predecessor of the Stoics. Zeller says (p. 669), "Der κοινὸς λόγος muss . . . . bei Heraklit im wesentlichen das Gleiche bedeuten wie bei seinen Nachfolgern den Stoikern." He recognizes that many of the statements in the doxographical reports belong essentially to the Stoic interpreters and admits that in frag. 1 λόγος need not mean the *Vernunft* active in the world, but draws his proof from frag. 2: *διὸ δεῖ ἕπεσθαι τῷ ξυνῷ . . . . τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἐόντος ξυνοῦ ζώουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἰδίαν ἔχοντες φρόνησιν.* It seems unwarranted to conclude from the parallelism of κοινὸς λόγος and ἰδία φρόνησις here that the λόγος can only be *Vernunft.* More light would seem to be cast on the interpretation by comparing frag. 72: *ᾧ μάλιστα διηνεκῶς ὁμιλοῦσι λόγῳ (τῷ τὰ ὅλα διοικοῦντι) τούτῳ διαφέρονται, καὶ οἷς καθ' ἡμέραν ἐγκυροῦσι, ταῦτα αὐτοῖς ξένα φαίνεται* (cf. also frag. 17). The λόγος is that whose recognition constitutes real understanding. It is "common" and can easily be observed by anyone, but men are blinded by their own putative wisdom. It is in this sense that we must understand the explanation of Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. math.* viii. 8), which Zeller arbitrarily rejects, that κοινὸς λόγος means *τὰ κοινῇ φαινόμενα.*

The interpretation of Heraclitus' "Word" as reason, intelligence, or sense has been very widespread, and the various versions attribute varying degrees of ideality to the concept. Dean Inge illustrates one extreme when he says, "For him the visible world is a symbolic system which half conceals and half reveals the reality. The truth or reality is the divine soul of the world, whose life is manifested in the endless cycle of birth and death, of becoming, change, decay, and renewal."[10] According to Aall, the Logos is "die Vernunft als universelles

[10] Art. "Logos," Hasting's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.*

Paradigma für den menschlichen Geist. . . . . Derselbe Logos manifestiert sich im Aeusseren, welches nach seinem Bild geschaffen ist."[11]

An important new treatment of the use of λόγος in the early philosophers is contained in the *Wortindex* to the fifth edition of Diels's *Vorsokratiker* by Walter Kranz (Vol. III [Berlin, 1937]). The senses of the word are classified as follows: (1) *Wort,* (2) *Darlegung,* (3) *Rede* (*Rhetorisches*), (4) *Vernunft, Sinn,* (5) *Berechnung, Gesetz, Verhältnis.* Certain differences between this classification and that of the Liddell and Scott lexicon become immediately apparent. The historical development of the meanings of the word is not taken into consideration in the arrangement, and the one which we have found to be primary (*Berechnung*) is relegated to the end of the article.[12] More important, there appears here an entire category under the lemma "Vernunft, Sinn," which, according to the history of the word, represents a derived and relatively late sense. Examination of the passages cited by Kranz will, I think, show the inadvisability of assigning such a significance to the λόγος as early as Heraclitus, and perhaps to any of the Presocratics.[13]

A large number of the examples are from Heraclitus himself. The section is divided into "Weltvernunft" and "menschliche Vernunft"; and, although we are told (p. 261*a*13) that in Heraclitus the two mean the same, the passages from that philosopher are distributed between the two divisions. We proceed, then, to consider the Heraclitean fragments classed as exemplifying world-reason. In frag. 50, which occurs in the ninth book of Hippolytus' *Refutatio,* is the phrase *εἶναι τὸ πᾶν . . . . λόγον αἰῶνα.* However, this first sentence of the passage from Hippolytus is not part of the fragment proper. In any case, although it may be analogous to frag. 1 (*ἐόντος ἀεί*) and reflect Heraclitean doc-

[11] *Gesch. d. Logosidee i. d. griech. Phil.* (Leipzig, 1896).

[12] There is a certain difficulty too in regarding λόγος as equal to *blosses Wort* (p. 258*a*16). This is scarcely borne out by the instances cited, many of which clearly show the rhetorical usage of the word, indicating the tenuousness of any distinction between λόγος as "blosses Wort" and as "Rede," e.g., Dem. frag. 51: *ἰσχυρότερος ἐς πειθὼ λόγος . . . . χρυσοῦ*; frag. 110: *γυνὴ μὴ ἀσκείτω λόγον.*

[13] Busse (*op. cit.*, p. 211), says that in Heraclitus there are no passages in which an active function is attributed to the λόγος, or where it is to be understood as either "world-reason" or simple "reason." H. Gomperz, in " 'Heraklits Einheitslehre' von Alois Patin als Ausgangspunkt zum Verständnis Heraklits," *Wien. Stud.*, XLIII (1923), 125, n. 1, has attempted to show that λόγος never means "reason" (*Vernunft*) in the fifth century.

trine, there is no reason inherent in the fragment itself for regarding the λόγος as reason.

In frag. 31 we have this sentence, explaining Heraclitus' cryptical statement about the "turnings" of fire: *δυνάμει γὰρ λέγει ὅτι τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ διοικοῦντος λόγου καὶ θεοῦ τὰ σύμπαντα δι' ἀέρα τρέπεται εἰς ὑγρόν.* This seems at first to state a world-reason doctrine quite clearly. But two considerations dispel the necessity and diminish the likelihood of such an explanation. As the word *δυνάμει* shows, this is only a paraphrase explanation of Heraclitus' words, or perhaps even simply an interpretation out of whole cloth. And, in the second place, the interpreter is Clement of Alexandria, who had behind him a long tradition of Stoic and Christian Logos doctrine.

Aet. i. 7. 22 (*Vors.*[5] 22A8): *εἱμαρμένην δὲ λόγον* (*sc. εἶναι*) *ἐκ τῆς ἐναντιοδρομίας δημιουργὸν τῶν ὄντων.* Besides the fact that the terminology of this passage is late, the words *ἐκ τῆς ἐναντιοδρομίας* seem to speak rather against than for the translation "world-reason."[14]

An important doxographical statement of the views of Heraclitus is contained in Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* vii. 126 ff. After stating that for Heraclitus the common and divine Logos was the criterion of truth, he proceeds (129): *τοῦτον οὖν τὸν θεῖον λόγον καθ' Ἡράκλειτον δι' ἀναπνοῆς σπάσαντες νοεροὶ γινόμεθα.* The epistemological reference here is admittedly late. Neither the division of reason from sense nor the concern with a criterion of truth is as early as Heraclitus. If the passage is based on genuine Heraclitean material, as it may well be,[15] the belief reflected is much more likely to be in a world-soul than in a world-reason. In early Greek thought (and as late as Plato's *Timaeus*) it was common to think of the universe as a living being, and it was natural to think of the principle of life (i.e., essentially, breath) as being drawn in from the surrounding air. This was the view of Anaximenes.[16]

Fragment 2 (*τοῦ λόγου ἐόντος ξυνοῦ, κτλ.*) simply states an attribute of the λόγος and not its nature. Much the same thing can be said of frag. 50 (*οὐκ ἐμοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου ἀκούσαντας*). It would be begging the

[14] Neither does the passage in i. 28. 1 prove anything in this sense (see below, p. 337).

[15] O. Gigon, *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit* (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 112 f.

[16] Frag. 2. Cf. the article of R. Mondolfo, "Anaximenea," *Riv. di filol.*, LXIV (1936), 15 ff.

question to use this as positive evidence for this interpretation of the λόγος even if the text were certain.[17]

In frag. 72 (ᾧ ὁμιλοῦσι λόγῳ τῷ τὰ ὅλα διοικοῦντι, τούτῳ διαφέρονται, κτλ.), as Diels indicates, the phrase τῷ τὰ ὅλα διοικοῦντι does not belong with the fragment proper. It provides a good example of the methods of quotation often used by the Stoic writers and commentators (the citation is from Marcus Aurelius) and the way in which a number of the fragments of Heraclitus have become buried under layers of *accommodatio.*

In frag. 1 λόγος is probably, as Diels thinks, intended to bear two different senses. One is "this account." Whether the other is "reason" cannot be proven on the basis of this fragment alone.

The only instances of the word cited by Kranz as comparable to these are Leucippus frag. 2 and a report about Democritus from Simpl. *Phys.*, p. 28, l. 15 which surely do not belong here, and two passages from pseudo-Epicharmus.

Of the passages cited by Kranz under the lemma "menschliche Vernunft" none is impressive. Fragment 45 means that the soul is hard to fathom. Burnet's translation is: "You will not find the boundaries of soul by traveling in any direction, so deep is the *measure* of it." Fragment 115 (ψυχῆς ἐστι λόγος ἑαυτὸν αὔξων) probably means not, as Diels would have it, that man's understanding grows with his age but that the soul is thought of as closely parallel, in nature and functions, to the body, as needing and receiving nourishment, and consequently as "growing."[18]

Kranz lists a number of passages from other authors here, but it would not be worth while to discuss them in detail. It is doubtful whether any of them can be said to attest the use of λόγος as reason among the Presocratics. By far the most of them are from the A divisions, and many of these quite obviously belong to later interpretation. The passages from Heraclitus have been seen to prove nothing. In Parmenides frag. 7, l. 5 (κρῖναι δὲ λόγῳ πολύδηριν ἔλεγχον), λόγος means "dialectical argument," as Burnet says,[19] or "thought" in the sense of the weighing of reasons, and is distinct from the Heraclitean usage.

This discussion has perhaps helped to establish the presumption

[17] λόγου is Bergk's reading. On the text cf. *Vors.*^{5}, I, 161.16 n.

[18] See Gigon, *op. cit.*, p. 105, and cf. esp. frag. 12.

[19] *EGP*^{3}, p. 173, n. 1.

that it is a mistake to attribute to Heraclitus a "Reason" or "Word" like that of the Stoics, representing a divine mind which orders and disposes the universe. Let us proceed to consider other possible views. In view of the frequent use of λόγος to mean "speech," "explanation," etc., and of its use in the titles of books, it is difficult not to conjecture that in Heraclitus it may signify simply the content of his book. However, frag. 2 (*τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἐόντος ξυνοῦ*) shows what is evident from other fragments as well: that the λόγος is not *simply* "my explanation." Gigon[20] has shown very well that in the prologue, reflected fairly completely in frags. 1 and 2, Heraclitus plays on the meaning of λόγος and establishes (not necessarily with complete deliberation, as Gigon thinks) three characteristics of it. It is true, all things come to be in accordance with it, and it is "common." Gigon emphasizes that in recognition of this fact explanation of the fragments must be based on the lexical meanings of λόγος common at Heraclitus' time. He rejects any interpretation in terms of cosmology. "Vor der Stoa ist eine irgendwie kosmische Bedeutung von λόγος unbekannt."[21] Lexically, then, he says, the word signifies in frags. 1, 2, 50, 72, and 108

> die Rede, der Inhalt des Buches. . . . . λόγος ist ein abgekürztes Zeichen für die Summe des Buches—die ewige Wahrheit . . . . λόγος hat diese seine Bedeutung nur im Zusammenhang mit dem heraklitischen Werke, nicht wie *πόλεμος* oder *ξυνόν* auch absolut, da ja die Prädikate auch auf "*diesen*" einen (ὅδε) λόγος gestellt werden. Die Summe des Buches wird als ewige Wahrheit prädiziert. Philosophisch ist sehr wichtig, dass die Prädikate der *ἀρχή* nun auf die "Wahrheit" fallen. Nicht ein Stoff, sondern eine Lehre, ein System steht am Anfang.[22]

This is a valuable observation, and it will be well to bear it in mind. The λόγος doubtless does carry to some extent the implication of "truth"; but since the use of the word specifically as equal to "truth" is late, if indeed it occurs at all (and, even according to Gigon's interpretation, it can only mean "this book as an embodiment of truth"), it may be well to look for more specific implications.

The problem is to find the way in which the idea of universality must be connected with the normal or possible meanings of λόγος without bringing in semi-mystical concepts of a world-reason or world-soul. The central point to Heraclitus is the recognition of a principle of development and process. The *ἓν τὸ σοφόν* of frag. 41 is contrasted

[20] *Op. cit.*, pp. 1 ff. [21] *Ibid.*, p. 4. [22] *Ibid.*

with the πολυμαθίη (frag. 40) which does not bring understanding (νόον ἔχειν). It is in this sense that we must interpret frag. 108, in which he complains of his predecessors that not one had attained to the realization that "wisdom is apart from all" (σοφόν ἐστι πάντων κεχωρισμένον). The comprehension of this relationship is associated for Heraclitus with γνώμη (insight), σοφόν (wisdom), and probably φρήν and νοῦς. This is what he finds lacking in his predecessors. τίς γὰρ αὐτῶν νόος ἢ φρήν; (frag. 104).[23]

It is not easy to avoid exaggerating the ideal abstraction of Heraclitus' thought when dealing with the more general aspects of his system. Snell has shown in an interesting study of the language of Heraclitus[24] that the actual language used in many of the fragments usually treated as simply "philosophical" is not abstract and conceptual but springs directly from personal experience and a sympathetic rather than coldly logical understanding. "Es gilt überhaupt für Heraklit, dass er die Sprache durchaus als ein Empfindender handhabt, sie aber nicht so sehr nach der logischen Klarheit hin entwickelt."[25] For example, in frag. 126 the oppositions are living and not logical oppositions: τὰ ψυχρὰ θέρεται, θερμὸν ψύχεται, ὑγρὸν αὐαίνεται, καρφαλέον νοτίζεται. This means not simply "cold becomes warm, warm becomes cold, etc.," but "cold things warm themselves, what is warm cools itself off, etc." Here, as in many other Heraclitean fragments, both the conception and the language are poetical. καρφαλέος is not found otherwise in prose, νοτίζω and θέρομαι only seldom.[26] This realization is very important for the understanding of Heraclitus' thought. A system of rigid, logical oppositions would lead inevitably to an absolute; for Heraclitus just as the oppositions are living and actual in experience, that which joins them is accessible to man.

Recognizing the damage done to our knowledge of Heraclitus by the distortions of the Stoics and the doxographical tradition and also the danger of importing modern concepts into an ancient context, Snell begins with consideration of the normal implications of words and develops an interesting suggestion as to the meaning of λόγος to

[23] An interesting example is the word-play in frag. 114 (ξὺν νῷ . . . . ξυνῷ). Cf. also frags. 78 and 41.

[24] "Die Sprache Heraklits," *Hermes*, LXI (1926), 353–81.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 357.

[26] *Ibid.* Heraclitus' attitude toward the world is reflected also in the words which he uses for understanding (σύνεσις, συνιέναι).

Heraclitus. He points out that λέγειν can frequently be translated "to signify" and holds that this connotation passes into the verbal noun λόγος. Thus λόγος has the double sense of meaningful human speech and the meaning which lies in things. Things speak to us, as it were. Thus the λόγος of frag. 1, says Snell, is not only the "explanation" of Heraclitus. This explanation has actuality. It is more than the "opinion" of the philosopher; it is the "sense" which is in the world and which alone gives "content" to the world. In the same way γνώμη, τὸ σοφόν, and the other designations for this single principle have a comparable "double meaning":

> Er sagt einmal: Nicht auf mich hört, sondern auf den Logos usw. (fr. 50). Wir verderben die eigentümliche Prägung des Gedankens, wenn wir übersetzen: nicht auf mich hört, sondern auf die Weltvernunft. Nein, er will sagen: Dieser Logos, den ihr verstehen sollt, ist nicht etwas Willkürlich-Persönliches von mir sondern er "ist"—er ist Sinn, Bedeutung, das Tiefste und Eigentlichste der Welt. Und solch ein Satz zeigt, wie wenig Heraklit "Individualist" ist. Freilich, er sondert sich stolz ab von den übrigen—aber er will nicht sich, sondern fühlt sich gerade gebunden an das Allgemeine.[27]

It would seem, however, that the significance of the fragment is somewhat more simple than this. The point is not so much that Heraclitus felt himself dependent on and connected with the universal, as that he felt strongly and wished to emphasize clearly that true understanding (σύνεσις) is only to be attained by attention to that which is *common*, the ξυνόν, by observance of "regularity" rather than of detail (πολυμαθίη). Undoubtedly, λόγος does carry some of the implication which Snell wishes to attribute to it. It means not only that which man says but that which speaks to man. It is rather different, however, to say that it is "the meaningful" or "Sinn, Bedeutung, das Tiefste und Eigentlichste der Welt." I believe we can assign it a more definite content than this.

A consequence of Snell's explanation which shows its inadequacy lies in the interpretation which he is compelled to give to the relationship of the λόγος to the νόμος of cities. Heraclitus draws the analogy clearly: ξὺν νῷ λέγοντας ἰσχυρίζεσθαι χρὴ τῷ ξυνῷ πάντων, ὅκωσπερ νόμῳ πόλις (frag. 114). According to Snell, "Der Logos, der die Bedeutung des Wortes meint, richtet sich auch bei Tatsachen nur auf die dahinter liegende Bedeutung, auf den einheitlichen Sinn der zwiespältigen

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

Erscheinung."[28] Thus νόμος is that which gives meaning to the city, which has force and is valid (p. 380). But it seems strangely forced to say that a city must defend the νόμος as it does its walls (frag. 44) because that is what gives the city significance. It would argue an abstraction far greater than Snell attributes elsewhere to Heraclitus to suppose that, when he says of the law κρατεῖ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ὁκόσον ἐθέλει καὶ ἐξαρκεῖ πᾶσι καὶ περιγίνεται (frag. 114), he means that the law is as valid ("gilt") as it wishes to be. Heraclitus is a theoretician, in the sense that he deals with general concepts and principles, but he is not to be thought of as a closet philosopher. Fragments 80, 43, 44, 121, and others show a lively and concrete practical interest not only in justice and the principles governing human relationships but in certain particular situations and struggles. His philosophy was formed with one eye constantly focused on the practical concerns of the world about him.

The relation of the λόγος to empirical things is clearly indicated by frag. 54: ἁρμονίη ἀφανὴς φανερῆς κρείττων. Hidden harmony is better than apparent harmony. Fragment 51 shows that ἁρμονίη means "fitting-together" and is to be understood as referring to the doctrine of opposites. There is no good reason simply to interpret this ἁρμονίη ἀφανής as God. It is rather the invisible unity which is implicit in the oppositions of the world-process, that which makes the πόλεμος τῶν ἐναντιοτήτων understandable to man. Obviously, this is not far from the λόγος of fragments 1 and 2. What, then, is the "apparent harmony"? Evidently, the states of equilibrium which are observable everywhere. The eternal give and take of fire-earth-water-earth-fire is at a standstill in an ordinary object like a table. Its appearance of permanence we interpret as real permanence, whereas in fact it is involved in the eternal process of change. Real knowledge is apprehension of the "hidden harmony"; concern with the apparent is πολυμαθίη.

It is interesting to correlate this fact with the concept of νόμος. One would expect the law of a city to be a good example of "apparent harmony." Social institutions are always in flux, and it is war which assigns to men their stations in life (frag. 53); yet we learn that, just as man must hold to the λόγος, the city must hold to its law.[29] It is not

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 379.

[29] Cf. frag. 44, where δῆμος, as Vollgraff shows (*Mnem.*, XLV [1917], 166–80), means not *plebs* but *populus*.

an apparent or momentary equilibrium but a static principle, consistent with the philosopher's well-known aristocratic political sympathies. Heraclitus' philosophy is not a closed system, consistent in every respect. Alongside the vigorous affirmation of the fact of change are hints of a static world.

An aspect of the significance of the word λόγος, which I believe has not been sufficiently emphasized as contributing to the Heraclitean concept, is that of proportionality, measure, and relationship. There are some fragments in which λόγος surely bears this meaning. In frag. 31, λόγος may mean either "amount" or "proportion": *θάλασσα διαχέεται καὶ μετρέεται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ὁκοῖος πρόσθεν ἦν ἢ γενέσθαι γῆ.* In the cyclical process of the change of the elements the sea is poured back in the same proportion, or to the same amount, as before it became earth. That Heraclitus was thinking of the quantitative relations of fire and water is shown by the last sentence of this fragment.[30]

We may compare also frag. 115: *ψυχῆς ἐστι λόγος ἑαυτὸν αὔξων.* The λόγος of the soul increases itself. Doubtless Gigon is right in understanding this to refer to the need of the soul for nourishment, possibly from the blood.[31] We learn from frag. 12 that "souls rise from dampness by evaporation." Even the soul is not a fixed and changeless thing but is involved as an integral member in the war of opposites. While it is impossible to determine the exact bearing of Heraclitus' observation, it may be directed, at least in part, toward such a conception of the soul as was held by the Orphics and Pythagoras, which tended to make it a thing wholly separate and apart from the body and superior to physical change. Heraclitus shows that change is inherent in the very constitution of the soul.

The idea of proportionality is explicitly brought into connection with the Heraclitean cosmology in frag. 94: *ἥλιος γὰρ οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται τὰ μέτρα, εἰ δὲ μή, Ἐρινύες μιν Δίκης ἐπίκουροι ἐξευρήσουσιν.* Here the *μέτρα* of the sun are probably the measures of kindling and extinction, like those of the ever living universal fire: *πῦρ ἀείζωον, ἁπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα* (frag. 30). The interchange of elements in the

[30] A. Aall (*op. cit.*, pp. 33 f.) interprets λόγος as *Verhältnis*, "ratio," but then, to save his general interpretation of the word as *Vernunft*, says, "Wie man sich aber auch immer die Worte zurechtlegen mag, über die Bedeutung 'Wort' und auf die Bedeutung von Vernunft sind wir hingewiesen."

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

world-process is elsewhere compared to a trade transaction: *πυρός τε ἀνταμοιβὴ τὰ πάντα καὶ πῦρ τῶν πάντων, ὅκωσπερ χρυσοῦ χρήματα καὶ χρημάτων χρυσός* (frag. 90).

The notion of proportionality and exchange was not original with Heraclitus, for in large part he was simply carrying out an idea which had been one of the focal points of the philosophy of the Milesians. As the war of opposites is foreshadowed in the cosmology of Anaximander, in which the interaction of the opposites separated out from the *ἄπειρον* constitutes the world-process, so the *λόγος* or proportion, the principle of regularity and meaningfulness, is anticipated in the *τάξις τοῦ χρόνου* of the earlier philosopher. Here, in frag. 94, *δίκη* has much the same function as in frag. 1 of Anaximander. Directly to be compared with the fragment of Anaximander is Heraclitus frag. 80: *εἰδέναι δὲ χρὴ τὸν πόλεμον ἐόντα ξυνόν, καὶ δίκην ἔριν, καὶ γινόμενα πάντα κατ' ἔριν καὶ χρεών*, where the reading *χρεών*, proposed by Diels for the manuscript *χρεώμενα*, is certainly correct.[32] In Anaximander things pay penalty to one another for their injustice *κατὰ τὸ χρεών*; in Heraclitus the coming-to-be of all things (i.e., the world-process, which is essentially the reciprocal interaction of opposites) takes place *κατ' ἔριν καὶ χρεών*. A similar concept is to be found in the *πύκνωσις καὶ ἀραίωσις* attributed to Anaximenes. It is notable that, while he engages in vigorous polemic against Homer, Archilochus, Hesiod, Hecataeus, Xenophanes, and especially Pythagoras, Heraclitus' only mention of the Milesian philosophers is in frag. 38, which states that Thales was the first astronomer.

It has been noted that special prominence is to be given to the significances of *λόγος* connected with "counting" and "rendering account." The conjecture seems justified that these implications were much more prominent in the mind of one who used the word at the time of our philosopher than later. The meaning of "proportion" is at least as old as Theognis, who wrote in the sixth century, and many examples are found from the succeeding period.[33] Besides the fragments already quoted, Heraclitus has other analogous uses. The difficult and doubtful frag. 126*a* may be mentioned,[34] as well as 67*a:* "(corpori

[32] Cf. *Vors.*^{5}, I, 169.5 n.

[33] See the convenient collection, *ibid.*, III, 261*b*–62*a*.

[34] *κατὰ λόγον δὲ ὡρέων συμβάλλεται ἑβδομὰς κατὰ σελήνην, κτλ.*

anima) proportionaliter iuncta est." There are one or two passages from the doxography which may reflect Heraclitean usage in this particular, especially Aet. i. 28. 1; i. 7. 22.[35] Although these passages are obviously distorted by Stoic hands, the juxtaposition of λόγος and *μέτρον* and the reference to *ἐναντιοδρομία* are significant.

The usage is found elsewhere in the Presocratics, as in Empedocles frag. 61: *ὅσα μὴ κατὰ τὸν οἰκεῖον συνῆλθε λόγον, ἐφθάρη*, frag. 131, and Zeno 29A29 (Simplicius); but by far the greatest number of instances are in the Pythagorean literature, where λόγος becomes a technical term. The concept of proportion was very important in Pythagorean philosophy, and, in spite of the many difficult problems in the Pythagorean literature and tradition, it can doubtless be considered a characteristic feature even of the earliest Pythagoreanism. Pythagoras himself is said by Eudemus to have been the inventor of the method of ratios: *τὴν τῶν ἀνὰ λόγον πραγματείαν ἀνεῦρεν.*[36] The Pythagoreans found the *πάθη καὶ λόγους* of harmony in numbers.[37] In the oldest Pythagorean writers of whom we have any considerable fragments, Archytas and Philolaus, λόγος is taken for granted as a technical term.[38] I would suggest that, in using the word, Heraclitus may have been influenced by Pythagoras. There are other indications of similar influences. There can be little doubt that, when he speaks of *ἁρμονία*, he is thinking of Pythagoras' work.[39] Some of the fragments concerned would not in themselves necessarily suggest a musical reference, as frag. 8 (*τὸ ἀντίξουν συμφέρον καὶ ἐκ τῶν διαφερόντων καλλίστην ἁρμονίαν*) or frag. 54 (*ἁρμονίη ἀφανὴς φανερῆς κρείττων*). But compare with the first of these Philolaus' definition of harmony: *ἔστι γὰρ ἁρμονία*

[35] *Vors.*[5], 22 A 8.

[36] Procl. *in Eucl.* 65.11; Friedlein (*Vors.*[5], 14.6*a*).

[37] Ar. *Met.* A 5. 985*b*23 ff. (*Vors.*[5], 58 B 4).

[38] Arch. frag. 2, Ptol. *Harm.* i. 13, p. 30 Düring (*Vors.*[5], 47 A 16), *Theol. Arithm.*, p. 82. 10 deFalco (*Vors.*[5], 44 A 13, I, 401.17). See further the examples given by Kranz, *Vors.*[5], III, 261*b*–62*a;* Nicomachus *Introd. arithm.*, ii. 21. 3 (p. 120 Hoche); and the notes of D'Ooge, Robbins, and Karpinski, *Nicomachus of Gerasa, Introduction to Arithmetic* (New York, 1926), pp. 264–65.

[39] Cf. H. Fränkel, "A Thought Pattern in Heraclitus," *AJP*, LIX (1938), 321; W. Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa* (Berlin, 1914), p. 109: "Die harmonische Bildung der Gegensätze, dies aus der Musiktheorie genommene Bild Heraklits mutet pythagoreisch an. Er spricht ja von der Leier. Dass er Pythagoras in der Polemik kennt, wissen wir. Aber er hat von ihm Wesentliches gelernt."

πολυμιγέων ἕνωσις καὶ δίχα φρονεόντων συμφρόνησις (frag. 10) and with the second the phrase from the catechism of the Pythagorean acusmatics:[40] *τί κάλλιστον; ἁρμονία.* That a reference to music was at the back of Heraclitus' mind is shown clearly by such phrases as *οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἶναι ἁρμονίαν μὴ ὄντος ὀξέος καὶ βαρέος*,[41] the musical reference of frag. 10, or the famous frag. 51: *οὐ ξυνιᾶσιν ὅκως διαφερόμενον ἑωυτῷ ὁμολογέει· παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη ὅκωσπερ τόξου καὶ λύρης.*

The use of the word *κόσμος* for the world is analogous to the use of *ἁρμονία*. As the latter denotes the fitting-together of things, *κόσμος* means primarily the *order* in which particulars work together to form a unified whole. The two terms are connected by Philolaus in frag. 6. The *Wortindex* (p. 241*a*23 ff.) shows that the word *κόσμος* was frequently used by the Pythagoreans but not by the Ionians or the Ionian tradition. It is very frequent in the doxography, but not attested for the actual words of the philosophers except Heraclitus, Empedocles, and the Pythagoreans. Pythagoras himself is reported to have been the first to call the heaven by that name.[42]

In a recent article Hermann Fränkel has shown that the concept of the geometrical proportion runs through the whole of Heraclitus' thought, forming a "thought pattern" which serves as a framework for many of his ideas and at the same time influences to a great extent the substance of Heraclitus' thought.[43] For example, in frag. 79, the relations of man to god are clarified by the use of a geometrical progression: *ἀνὴρ νήπιος ἤκουσε πρὸς δαίμονος, ὅκωσπερ παῖς πρὸς ἀνδρός.* That is to say, god:man::man:child. As Fränkel says, this observation shows primarily the comparative lowliness of man. He is wise in comparison with a child, but foolish when compared to a god.

It is not necessary to examine in detail all the examples discussed by Fränkel. They show convincingly that the idea of the geometrical proportion pervades Heraclitus' philosophy. But what is the significance of this in relation to the substance of his beliefs and point of view? Fränkel thinks of Heraclitus' activity as a search for a meta-

[40] Iam. *V.P.* 82.

[41] Ar. *Eud. Eth.* H 1. 1235*a*28.

[42] Aet. ii. 1. 1 (*Vors.*[5], 14. 21): *Πυθαγόρας πρῶτος ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν ὅλων περιοχὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τάξεως.*

[43] *Op. cit.*, pp. 309–37.

physical reality which transcends the world of change. In the example given above, the worthlessness of man is to be understood by reference to the "perfection" of the divinity; and it is brought out in order to point emphatically, by contrast, toward that perfection. The same is true of the comparison of man, god, and ape in frags. 82 and 83. The thought pattern is used primarily to express the inexpressible, to bring closer by extrapolation that which is ordinarily beyond human reach. It thus becomes a device to approach the transcendental, metaphysical reality, somewhat in a mystical sense.[44] However, this does not seem entirely consistent with Heraclitus' general point of view. The principle and law embodied in the λόγος and the divinity seem to be not transcendent but immanent in the world-process. The words of frag. 79, cited above, do not in themselves prove the existence of an "absolute,"[45] but only that the divine is relatively much wiser than man. On the other hand, frag. 67, e.g., clearly shows the divinity subject to change, entering into (or being implicit in) the "war of opposites."[46]

Fränkel's penetrating analysis provides welcome corroboration for the view of the λόγος expressed above and confirms the suspicion that Heraclitus may have come under the influence, in some respects, of Pythagoras.[47] Of course, it must be emphasized that, however much Heraclitus may have been influenced in his terminology or even his way of thinking by Pythagoras, he cannot in any sense be called a Pythagorean. In fact, though he has little good to say of any of his predecessors, Pythagoras is singled out especially in frag. 40, where the inadequacy of his learning is asserted, and in the extremely caustic sarcasm of frag. 129. Probably the most we are justified in conjecturing in the way of influence of Pythagoras on Heraclitus is the suggestion of the general idea of the application of proportionality to cosmic process. The mathematical and musical pronouncements of Pythagoras worked germinally in the mind of Heraclitus and helped in

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 324 f. and n. 35. Fränkel draws a parallel between the attitude of Heraclitus and that of the medieval Christian mystics.

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 316 f.

[46] *ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός . . . . ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ πῦρ, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.*

[47] *Op. cit.*, p. 321.

shaping the form of his discourse. However, the concept carried different implications for the two systems. For Pythagoras harmony and proportion meant proper subordination of the inferior, and the existence of a transcendent principle which guaranteed the justice and the continuance of this state of affairs. For Heraclitus it meant recognition of the principle of strife and the perception of the beauty of unity rising from difference. To both the Pythagoreans and Plato true wisdom was the recognition of the changeless as the only real, whereas for Heraclitus it was the fact of change itself which was fundamental.

The content of the vision which Heraclitus desiderates is in a sense "metaphysical" in that it involves perception of essentially abstract relationships. The λόγος is present to all the phenomena of nature. It is the key to all knowledge and must be insisted upon with great emphasis. But, for all that, it does not imply a world apart from everyday life and experience.[48] In the pattern of the geometric mean (A:B::B:C) as used by Heraclitus, much emphasis is laid on the possibility or necessity of transition from one term to another. For example, in cosmology fire:sea::sea:earth;[49] the ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω is a continual process of transformation among these elements. If the proportion is used among the Pythagoreans, the point is that the relations are unchangeable. According to Heraclitus, the fluctuating vicissitudes of life make men slaves or kings, or even gods (frag. 53), but in the Pythagorean conception some are created better, some worse—some rulers, some ruled. The principle of justice, as in Plato, is akin not to strife but to harmony; and prudence is willing submission to one's lot.[50]

Perhaps the English word which can best cover most of the meaning which the λόγος has for Heraclitus is "account." The λόγος is first of all Heraclitus' story, his explanation, and perhaps even his book.

[48] It is difficult to expel from the interpretation of Heraclitus the separation of object and subject, thing and idea, God and the world, which has dominated philosophy since Plato. But even fragments like 32 and 108 probably do not involve this separation. As the latter shows clearly, the frame of reference is primarily the originality of Heraclitus' message and that which is separated from all things is not a transcendent God but a principle of explanation.

[49] Frags. 31, 36, 90, etc.; Fränkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 329 ff.

[50] Cf. Iam. *V.P.*, 130, 174–76, 183, etc.

This appears from frag. 1. But the word carries also the implication that it is a true account; it is the "meaning" of things. And since it is considered, in a sense, as itself a thing, it carries definite implications also as to the content of this true report. It is analogous to *νόμος*; and as *νόμος* is custom and usage, the way men behave, finally crystallized into a rule for behavior, so the *λόγος* indicates the way in which the world-process moves, the usage of phenomena, so to speak. As we observe the history of the world unfolding, it appears to us as a cosmos. The striking fact that there is a *νόμος* for world-events as well as for human intercourse becomes gradually apparent. This realization had been prepared but not clearly stated by the predecessors of Heraclitus. He seized upon it and made it the central point in his system, naturally exaggerating the magnitude of his advance; and he represents in a way the culmination and summing-up of a whole process of philosophical development. The nature of Heraclitus' perception of world-process is known. To him it was a war of conflicting forces, not simply drawn up on two sides but present everywhere as opposites. The *ἔρις* was for Heraclitus radical and universal, not simply a superficial or apparent struggle which is meaningless because transcended by a single omnipotent principle. This distinction is frequently overlooked by those who explain his philosophy. The *λόγος* then is the *νόμος*, the *ratio*, the explanation or meaning, and hence in a qualified sense the law or regularity inherent in the process. The *λόγος* is considered as a thing, named and spoken of as such, but not deified. I believe that Heraclitus' use of the concept will be considerably clarified if it is borne in mind that, when he said *λόγος*, there was present to his mind the complex of implications built up around the idea of proportionality, harmony, and rhythm by the Pythagoreans. Not only are there reflections of this in the language of the philosopher, but proportionality plays a significant role in the details of his system. But, most important, the world as a whole presents itself to him as a kind of harmony: *παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη, ὅκωσπερ τόξου καὶ λύρης*. Perhaps the perception of the amount he had in common with Pythagoras intensified Heraclitus' opposition to the latter and occasioned him to emphasize and define more clearly the uniqueness of his own theory.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

THE LARES AND THE KALENDS LOG

LESLIE D. JOHNSTON

FOR some time the conviction has been growing within me that an element of the worship of the Roman Lar, or Lares, had survived to modern times in the rites connected with the kalends log—better known to most of us as the Christmas, or Yule, log. Substantial evidence, I believe, points in this direction.[1]

Let us review briefly, first, some of the characteristics of the cult of the Lares. Offerings to the Lares were made in order to secure abundance, prosperity, good fortune, and the well-being of the household in general.[2] This association with general welfare is revealed by various illustrations. For example, Figure 4349 in Daremberg-Saglio (Wissowa, *op. cit.*, col. 1872) shows the Lar as a youth dressed in an ample tunic holding in his right hand a cake and in his left a horn of plenty. Figure 4350 is that of a dancing Lar[3] who holds a platter in his right hand and a rhyton in his left. A pig, a cock, and a snake appear also. The whole scene clearly signifies abundance, as Hild (p. 948) has observed. Similarly, the illustration in R. Cagnat and V. Chapot, *Manuel d'archéologie romaine*, II (Paris, 1920), 191, shows the relation of the Lares to the material welfare of the family. The same feeling is clearly expressed in a line which is thought to come from Ennius

[1] The idea that the worship of some god lurks beneath the rites of the Christmas log is not new, but I know of no one who has offered any specific suggestion as to the identity of that god or gods. C. A. Miles, *Christmas in Ritual and Tradition* (London, 1912), p. 252, in speaking of the Yule log, remarks that the hearth was the site of the ancestral spirits and compares the Lar, the spirit of the hearth, but he offers no argument. R. Meringer, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XVI (1904), 157, remarks: "Dass bis in die historische Zeit noch der göttlich verehrte Strunk auf italische Boden hereinreicht, wird uns nicht Wunder nehmen, wo wir ja sehen, dass dem Weihnachtsblock heute noch persönliche, göttliche Ehren erwiesen werden." E. Schneeweis, "Die Weihnachtsbräuche der Serbokroaten," *Ergänzungsband XV zur Wiener Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* (Wien, 1925), p. 190, observes that offerings made upon the Christmas log were similar to those made to the Roman Lar. On p. 28 he states that such offerings are certainly a remnant "des heidnischen Haus-Götzen-Opfers."

[2] G. Wissowa, *s.v.* "Lares" in Roscher's *Lexikon*, col. 1876; J. A. Hild, *s.v.* "Lares" in Daremberg-Saglio, pp. 938–39, 948.

[3] A statuette found at Mandeure (Doubs) and now in the Musée de Montbéliard.

(*Frag. dubia*, No. 28 in Steuart's ed. [Cambridge, 1925]): "Vosque Lares tectum nostrum qui funditus curant." Cato, moreover, says that on the kalends, ides, and nones, or whenever there was a festival day, the *vilica* laid a garland on the hearth and at the same time prayed to the Lar of the home *for abundance*.[4] Also the *pater familias*, when he came to the villa, after saluting the *Lar familiaris*, went around his farm on the same day if he could.[5] Although Cato does not say so, this must certainly have been done in order to put the land under closer influence of the Lar and therefore make it more productive. This same feeling of general protection we find in Plautus *Rudens* 1206–8: "atque adorna . . . . /Laribus familiaribus quom auxerunt nostram familiam"; in the *Aulularia* 385–87, where Euclio makes an offering to the Lar in order to secure a fortunate marriage for his daughter;[6] and, an excellent passage to illustrate the point, in *Trinummus* 39 ff.: "Larem corona nostrum decorari volo./Uxor, venerare ut nobis haec habitatio/ bona, fausta, felix fortunataque evenat." Similarly, Juvenal ix. 137 ff. indirectly addresses a prayer to the Lares to protect him in his old age.

The Lares, outside the house, were also concerned with prosperity, abundance, and the good of the crops. So it appears from Cato *De agric.* 2 referred to above.[7] Thus Tibullus i. 1. 19 ff. describes the offerings to the Lares, the *agri custodes*, "around whom the country youth shouted 'Hail! Give us good harvests and good wine.' " In the same sense Horace *Od.* iii. 23. 1 ff. informs *rustica Phidyle* that, if she shall have pleased the Lares on the first of the month with an offering of incense, this year's grain, and a pig, the hot African wind will not blast her grapes, the rust will not attack her crops, and the young of the flocks will not be injured by any bad season of the year.[8] Indeed,

[4] *De agric.* 143: "Kalendis, idibus, nonis, festus dies cum erit, coronam in focum indat, per eosdemque dies lari familiari pro copia supplicet." Frazer on Ovid *Fasti* ii. 615; Hild, p. 938; and Wissowa, cols. 1876–77, interpret *pro copia* to mean "for abundance" or "well-being." Hooper and Ash in the Loeb translation and Brehaut, *Cato the Censor on Farming* ("Columbia University Records of Civilization," No. 17) have different interpretations and translations, neither of which can be right.

[5] Cato 2.

[6] See the entire prologue to the *Aulularia*. Daily offerings of incense, wine, garlands, or other things were made to the Lar (ll. 24–25).

[7] See Wissowa, col. 1877, on this passage.

[8] Cf. *Ser.* ii. 5. 12 ff.

as Wissowa says (col. 1876), the Lar was the protector of the *familia* in the widest sense.

That the offering to the Lares was made upon the hearth is clear from Cato as quoted above, and from *De agric.* 5. 3, a passage which seems to refer to the Lares; from Plautus *Aul.* 386: "Haec imponentur in foco nostro Lari";[9] and from Vergil *Aen.* v. 744–45: "Pergameumque Larem . . . . farre pio et plena supplex veneratur acerra." Newlyweds made offering on the hearth (*in foco*) to the Lar, according to Varro, in Nonius (ed. Lindsay, p. 852). Pliny, *NH* xxviii. 27 also refers to the offering on the hearth, as does Servius on the *Aeneid* i. 730 (although Servius mentions no gods), and the *Codex Theodosianus* xvi. 10. 12 (A.D. 392).

Probably the most common offerings to the Lares were garlands (*coronae*),[10] incense, wine, and grain. With these last two I am particularly concerned. Plautus (*Aul.* 23 ff.) mentions incense, wine, garlands, and other things (*aliquid*); Juvenal (ix. 137 ff.) lists incense, grain, and garlands; Horace (*Od.* iii. 23. 3 ff.) gives incense and grain; Tibullus (i. 10. 15 ff.) includes wine, grain, and cakes. In representations of the Lar, a cake is sometimes shown in his hand (e.g., Daremberg-Saglio, Fig. 4349, as mentioned above); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiq. Rom.* iv. 14) mentions a special cake, *pelanos*, that was given to the Lar; and the stanza (quoted below) on the January picture of the Calendar of Philocalus informs us that *liba*, cakes, were given to him. While considering this point, one may well wonder if possibly the January picture in the mosaic from Carthage, dated by Webster[11] in the fourth to fifth century (?), portraying the labors of the months, may not illustrate an offering of cakes to the Lares. Also, in general, Pliny (*NH* xxviii. 27), Servius (*ad Aen.* i. 730), Ovid (*Fasti* ii. 633–34; referring to the Caristia), and probably Varro in Nonius

[9] Cf. *Aul.* 6 ff.: The treasure was buried under the hearth and so in the Lar's special care.

[10] Sometimes of grain. So Tibullus i. 10. 23: "seu dederat sanctae spicea serta comae."

[11] J. C. Webster, *The Labors of the Months* ("Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities," No. 4 [Evanston, 1938]), p. 123, Cat. No. 11, Pl. V. Webster describes the January figure as dressed "in mantle holding forked baton and basket(?) of breads(?). Cock stands at his feet." I am indebted to Professor Archer Taylor, of the University of Chicago, for calling my attention to this excellent work.

(ed. Lindsay, p. 872), refer to offerings of food.[12] Moreover, at the Caristia, February 22, the Lares shared in the sacred meal.[13]

That candles and lamps were burned to honor the Lares seems to be the meaning of Jerome *In Esaiae c. 57:* "Ipsaque Roma orbis domina, in singulis insulis domibusque, tutelae simulacrum cereis venerans ac lucernis." This is corroborated by the *Codex Theodosianus* (*loc. cit.*): "Nullus . . . . secretiore piaculo Larem igne . . . . , Penates odore veneratus accendat lumina. . . . ." Both passages might conceivably be regarded as evidence that the kalends log was burned to honor the Lares.

In order to prove my point, it is necessary, of course, to establish the fact that the Lares were worshiped to a considerable degree on the kalends of January. In the first place, then, the Lares were honored on all kalends, nones, ides, and festival days, according to Cato (n. 4 above). Propertius (iv. 3. 53 [v. 3. 53]), Tibullus (i. 3. 34), Horace (*Od.* iii. 23. 1 ff.), and Martial (iv. 66. 3) refer to this monthly rite on the kalends, although it had apparently fallen into disuse already by their time, probably because it had become concentrated on the kalends of January—the most important kalends of the year. That the Lares were worshiped on the kalends of January in particular seems to be indicated by a number of authorities. Suetonius (*Nero* xlvi. 2), in describing the happenings during the New Year's rites of the *Vota* and the taking of the auspices for the new year (i.e., A.D. 64), says: "Kalendis Ianuariis exornati Lares in ipso sacrificii apparatu conciderunt," a sinister omen and well worthy of mention by Suetonius in view of what followed. The Lares are probably meant also in *Galba* xviii. 3: "Observatum etiam est Kalendis Ianuariis sacrificanti coronam de capite excidisse," although it is possible that the Penates

[12] An interesting passage, pertinent here perhaps, occurs in Naogeorgus' *Regnum papisticum* (ed. 1559), p. 133 (dealing with New Year's customs): "Selectisque onerant dapibus mensasque focumque/ paneque vescuntur miro, magnisque placentis." For food offerings to the household gods at meal time see Hild, p. 947, with references, and Wissowa, cols. 1884–85, with references.

[13] Indeed, it is possible that the Caristia was absorbed by the New Year's festival because of the similarity of spirit, i.e., that spirit of peace, forgiveness, and good will toward everyone which was widespread among the Romans during the Saturnalia and *Kalendae Ianuariae.*

are also included.[14] Similarly, an inscription of the year A.D. 11: "K(alendis) quoque Ianuar(iis) thus et vinum colonis et incolis praestent,"[15] undoubtedly refers to the Lares as well as, probably, the Penates and the Genius of Augustus, which was closely associated with the Lares.[16] The incense and wine were furnished to enable the people to make the offering. Augustus, moreover, dedicated a statue to the *Lares publici* from the New Year's donations presented to him by the people in his absence.[17]

Very important for my argument is the calendar picture of Philocalus of A.D. 354, conveniently reproduced by Webster, Plate III.[18] The January picture shows a richly clad man (apparently an official) offering incense on a stand and bears a poem, the first two lines of which read:

> Hic Jani mensis sacer est, en aspice ut aris
> Tura micent, sumant ut pia liba Lares.

In the rustic pictorial calendar (dated by Webster, p. 123, Cat. No. 12, in the third to fourth century)[19] found at St. Romain-en-Gal in southern France, near ancient Vienna, depicting the various seasonal occupations, the fourth (Webster's No. V) picture of winter shows a man and a boy making an offering on a portable altar. This was certainly to the Lares or Penates, probably to both, that is, to the household gods in general. The mosaic from Carthage, which, according to Webster (p. 20), stems from the same source as the Calendar of Philocalus, shows the January figure dressed in a mantle holding a basket

[14] Probably both the Lares and the Penates were worshiped together on the kalends of January. Tibullus, i. 3. 33–34, couples them in the monthly offering, as does the *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 10. 12. The *Menologia rustica*, *CIL*, I, p. 358, records of the month of January: "sacrificant dis penatibus."

[15] *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, ed. Hermann Dessau, Vol. I (Berlin, 1892), No. 112.

[16] Boehm, *s.v.* "Lares" in Pauly-Wissowa, col. 811.

[17] Dessau, 99. "In his absence" because, if present, the custom was to return the gift doubled, tripled, or even fourfold, as in the case of Tiberius.

[18] After Strzygowski, *Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Erstes Ergänzungsheft* (1888), Pl. XXXIII. Discussed by Webster, pp. 14 ff.

[19] Reproduced in Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), Pl. XXVIII. Also in Webster, p. 123, Cat. No. 12, and Pl. VI (after Lafaye). Rostovtzeff's plate is much the better of the two. According to him, the mosaic formed the pavement of a large room in a private house at Vienna.

of cakes (?), an offering to the Lares(?).[20] Hence, the mere fact that the worship of the Lares had become sufficiently important to be included in calendar pictures as portraying the chief event in the month of January is ample evidence of the high centralization on January 1 of the worship of these deities.[21] Furthermore, the officious look of the persons in these three representations agree completely with Suetonius' remarks as quoted above.

The centralization, as I maintain, of the monthly rites to the Lares on the kalends of January undoubtedly was facilitated by the celebration of the Compitalia in which the *Lares compitales* were the main objects of worship. The Compitalia were an important part of the Roman midwinter celebration, usually falling about the first of the year.[22] Early in the Empire they became absorbed in the practices of the kalends of January.[23] The *ludi Compitales* are listed in the *Fasti* of Polemius Silvius of the year 448/49 on January 3. That date fell within the New Year's festival, of course, since this lasted until January 5. Inasmuch as the celebration of the *Kalendae Ianuariae* endured until the twelfth century, there is ample possibility that the cult of the Lares continued along with that popular festival.[24]

In consequence of these references I am fully convinced that the Lares were popularly worshiped on the kalends of January far more intensely and conspicuously than on any other kalends.

[20] The presence of the cock in this picture, as well as in that of the Calendar of Philocalus, recalls strongly the statuette of the Lar with a cock at his feet in the Musée de Montbéliard (Daremberg-Saglio, Fig. 4350, and described by Hild, p. 948), and undoubtedly is a strong point for connecting the picture in the mosaic with the worship of the Lares.

[21] See above, n. 14. The *Menologia rustica* adds further weight to this point.

[22] W. W. Fowler, *The Roman Festivals* (London, 1899), p. 279.

[23] Cf. Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (London, 1922), p. 81; M. P. Nilsson, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XIX (1916–19), 55 ff. and 88 (also Nilsson in Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* "Saturnalia," col. 206, and *s.v.* "Kalendae Ianuariae," col. 1563); Wissowa in Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* "Compitalia," col. 791.

[24] Cf. the description of the *Kal. Ian.* by Benedict, chorus leader of St. Peter's in Rome for the year 1142, quoted from Duchesne, *Le Liber censuum de l'église rom.*, II, 141–83, by F. Schneider, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XX (1920–21), 396, n. 1: "Mane [i.e., Kal. Ian.] autem surgunt duo pueri ex illis, accipiunt ramos olive et sal et intrant per domos. Salutant domum: 'Gaudium et leticia sit in hac domo'; de illis frondibus et sale plenam manum proiciunt in ignem et dicunt: 'Tot filii, tot porcelli, tot agni'; et de omnibus bonis optant." This is the well-known "first-foot" or "first-visitor" custom of Christmas and New Year's, at one time prevalent, and not yet entirely obsolete, throughout Europe, but similar rites occur over the Christmas log.

That the worship of the Lares lasted continuously in widely separated lands (e.g., France, Italy, North Africa, and certainly elsewhere if we believe Jerome) to the middle of the fifth century A.D. is clear from the mosaic from St. Romain-en-Gal (third to fourth century), the Calendar of Philocalus of 354, and the mosaic from Carthage (fourth to fifth century?) as described above; from the *Codex Theodosianus* xvi. 10. 12, of the year 392: "Nullus omnino . . . . secretiore piaculo Larem igne, mero Genium, Penates odore veneratus accendat lumina, imponat tura, serta suspendat"; from Jerome (d. 420), *In Esaiae c. 57*, who censures the inhabitants of Rome and the provinces because "post fores domorum idola ponerent quos domesticos appellant Lares"; and from the Calendar of Polemius Silvius of 448/49 which lists the *ludi Compitales*.

Although the "labor" of January continues to be represented by the figure making an offering down to the twelfth century,[25] it would be unsafe to say that this is evidence of contemporary offerings to the Lares. Rather, the pictures seem to go back to the Calendar of Philocalus for their traditional pattern, and yet they might well be an indication that the celebration of the kalends of January occupied a prominent place in the activities of the month, as it certainly did. This, indeed, appears to be true in the case of the relief on the jamb of the portal of the baptistery at Pisa (of the twelfth century).[26] The labors of the other months reflect current occupations, so that it is unnecessary to assume that January alone has been derived from the traditional representation, and does not therefore give a true picture of January "labor." The fire blazes much higher than in other representations and might easily illustrate Benedict's description of New Year's Day for the year 1142: "de illis frondibus et sale plenam manum proiciunt in ignem," as well as the feeling that good luck will come if the kalends log burns well.[27]

Undoubtedly, wherever in the Roman Empire a Roman peasant had taken up his abode, there he and his descendants established the

[25] Webster, p. 127, Cat. No. 20, Pl. IX, of the ninth century; p. 131, Cat. No. 26, Pl. XII, of the eleventh century, although Webster dates it in the ninth century in the text, p. 46; p. 131, Cat. No. 27, Pl. XIII, of the eleventh century; and p. 148, Cat. No. 52, Pl. XXXIII, of the twelfth century from Italy at Pisa.

[26] Webster, p. 148, Cat. No. 52, Pl. XXXIII.

[27] See above, n. 24, and the text thereto.

worship of the household gods, the Lares and Penates, and it is this worship which, as I maintain, has survived in some of the rites connected with the ancient kalends or Yule log.

The earliest specific reference to the kalends log is by Martin of Braga (d. 580), *De correctione rusticorum*, 16: "Vulcanalia et Kalendas observare, mensas ornare, lauros ponere, pedem observare, effundere [in foco] super truncum frugem et vinum, et panem in fontem mittere, quid est aliud nisi cultura diaboli?"[28] The words "effundere super truncum frugem et vinum" can hardly refer to anything other than the kalends log. Later ecclesiastical references are, in the forms of expression, derived from Martin, but the simple fact that the kalends log *did* survive into modern times makes it hard to believe that the practice did not exist as described.[29] Thus the Abbott Pirmin, *De singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*, 22[30] (composed between 724–27 at Lake Constance, according to Schneider, p. 109), reproduces Martin word for word in the part of the passage concerned here. A twelfth-century manuscript at Leyden has varied the words somewhat:[31] "et aquam fundere, in focum super truncum frumentum et vinum mittere, et panem in fontem ponere."[32]

All the practices mentioned here in connection with the *truncus* are well-known kalends rites, except the Vulcanalia (and I am inclined to believe that even this festival by that time fell within the period of midwinter festivities), and *aquam fundere* which must have been also

[28] C. P. Caspari, *Martin von Bracaras Schrift, De correctione rusticorum* (Christiania, 1883), p. 30. That these *rustici* were not the Suevic invaders of that area has been demonstrated by Schneider (p. 117), who remarks that the Suevi were the landlords and therefore could hardly have been the *rustici* of Martin, and that the *rustici* were the peasant population, which must have been, in my opinion, thoroughly Romanized during the seven preceding centuries of Roman domination.

[29] I am disposed to accept these later ecclesiastical attacks upon the kalends-log rites as referring to contemporary customs despite the verbal borrowing from Martin, either directly or indirectly.

[30] C. P. Caspari, *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota* (Christiania, 1883), I, 172.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

[32] Caspari punctuates with a comma after *focum*, less well, in my opinion, than before the phrase *in focum*. Compare the passage from Martin as quoted above. The meaning of *aquam fundere* might possibly be to pour out water with the attendant wish that the course of life for the coming year might flow just as smoothly. G. F. Abbott, *Macedonian Folklore* (Cambridge, 1903), p. 83, mentions such a custom occurring on January 2.

a New Year's superstition (see n. 32). From this fact it is evident that the kalends log belongs properly to the *Kalendae Ianuariae.* Further evidence of the connection with New Year's Day is to be found in various names of the log, in Provence, the most Romanized part of France, *calendeau, calendâou,* or *calignau;* in Dauphiné, *chalendal;* in Rumania, *calindau;* and in Bulgaria, *koladnik* or *prikladnik.*[33] The fact that in various places it was still burned on January 1, or at least part was saved to be rekindled then, shows an original connection with that date. Furthermore, the wishes uttered and the acts performed over the log belong to the New Year's celebration. Accordingly, I feel that we can safely accept the assertion that the kalends log belonged to good old Roman peasant customs of the new year.[34] If this be so, it is easy to see that the Lares may have been closely associated with the

[33] All these words are to be derived from the Latin *Kalendae.* For further details see W. Flusser, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie,* LI (1931), 14 ff.; Piotr Caraman, *Christmas Customs of the Slavs and Rumanians* (in Polish; Kraków, 1933), p. 397; W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3. Aufl.; Heidelberg), No. 1510; Schneeweis, pp. 174 ff., and on the name, pp. 174, 178, and 182; W. Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte* (2. Aufl.; Berlin, 1904), I, 226; J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (3d ed.; New York, 1935), X, 249–50; J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* (4. Ausg.; Berlin, 1875) I, 521–22; G. Bilfinger, *Untersuchung über die Zeitrechnung der alten Germanen,* II: *Das germanische Julfest, Program des Eberhard-Ludwigs-Gymnasiums* (Stuttgart, 1901), p. 35.

[34] So regarded by Schneider, pp. 119–20; Bilfinger, p. 59; E. H. Meyer, *Mythologie der Germanen* (Strassburg, 1903), p. 328; and Schneeweis, p. 183. Schneeweis argues thus: "If in philology we may assume the existence of unattested word-forms to which existing or attested words point, then we may do the same in folklore." And so it is perhaps with the kalends log. It seems to the writer of this article that there is truly little plausibility in the view that the log was other than Roman. Those who maintain that the Yule log was of northern origin do not pay sufficient regard to the remarkable agreement of the details in the rites over the log in early Spain, in France, Italy, and the southeastern European nations, nor do they bear in mind that these rites, religious and superstitious in character, are not found in England, Germany, etc., where they would have been most elaborate and persistent had the log been originally from the North. In northern lands the ceremonies are of a distinctive festive nature, as indicated by even the oldest Germanic witness of 1184 at Ahlen in Münsterland (Grimm[4], I, 522): "et arborem in nativitate Domini ad festivum ignem suum adducendam esse dicebat." Undoubtedly, England received the practice from France. The writer hopes to restate the arguments and resubmit proofs concerning the Yule log shortly by the publication of a monograph on the origins of Christmas customs. The belief that the Yule log is to be classed as a solstice fire, although supported by such eminent scholars as Mannhardt and Frazer, must be discarded. T. Trede (*Das Heidentum in der römischen Kirche, Bilder sittlichen Lebens Süditaliens* [Gotha, 1889–91], IV, 258), in speaking of the Christmas log (*ceppo*) in Calabria, calls it a custom much older than the city of Rome and Roman heathen religion.

kalends log by virtue of the simple fact that both were popularly worshiped on the kalends of January.

Whether or not the *Indiculus superstitionum*, XVII:[35] "De observatione pagana in foco vel in incohatione rei alicuius" refers to the kalends log, or to some other fire superstition cannot be determined, but the possibility that it does refer to the former cannot be denied. The reference calls to mind the passage in Tibullus ii. 5. 79–95, in which it is said that the crackling laurel indicated a good year and good crops,[36] and a very interesting passage in Dante's *Paradiso*, XVIII, 100–104: "Poi come nel percuoter de' ciocchi arsi/Surgono innumerabili faville,/Onde gli stolti sogliono agurarsi/Risurger parver quindi piu di mille/Luci." The three passages undoubtedly refer to the same custom, and quite probably this may be the same that we find playing such an important part in connection with the kalends or Christmas log, but I do not mean to imply that the same sort of divination was not practiced at other times. In fact, it must have been popular at any time, but particularly so at Christmas, New Year's, and Epiphany.[37]

To be sure, whenever an offering was made to the Lares upon the hearth, whenever the *corona* was laid upon the fire, the way it burned must have been very significant, precisely in the manner just described.[38] Consequently, it is not surprising to find the blazing fire playing an important part in the rites of the kalends or Christmas log. Thus prognostication from the sparks of the Christmas log was very

[35] *Mon. Ger. hist. capit. reg. Franc.*, I, 223. Of the eighth century.

[36] Although neither festival nor god is indicated, the first few lines surely refer to some winter or spring festival, since the sign foretells a good harvest, and by reason of the Lares' close association with good crops, it is not improbable that they are the gods to whom the offering is made. Compare the various kalends-log superstitions of this sort, all foretelling a good year.

[37] In Italy on New Year's Day, *Capo d'Anno*, on the red-hot floor of the hearth, leaves of laurel are allowed to fall one at a time. From the way the leaves twist about or remain motionless, the life of a person is determined. Also one determines the amount of the harvest, if one will become rich or poor, or be married, from the burning of the leaves. Similarly grains of wheat are put on the hearth. From the way these jump about, the price of grain throughout the year is determined (G. Finamore, *Credenze, usi e costumi Abruzzesi* in G. Pitrè's *Curiosità popolari tradizionali* [Palermo, 1890], VII, 73 f. and 83–84). Similar customs are described for Macedonia by Abbott, p. 78.

[38] Cf. Vergil *Aen.* v. 743–45: "Haec memorans cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignes; / Pergameumque Larem et canae penetralia Vestae / farre pio et plena supplex veneratur acerra."

popular among the Serbocroatians.[39] The father of the house, or the "first visitor," upon striking the log to make the sparks fly up, wished or prayed "as many sparks, so many sheep, money, kids, chicks, wheat with large heads, boys, calves, grey swine, black goats, and most of all, life and health." Much the same practice was current in France, in Auxois.[40] When the grandfather struck the log with a fire shovel, thus making numerous sparks jump forth, he uttered the following wish: "Bonne année, bonnes récoltes, autant de gerbes et de gerbillons." In Poitou[41] the moment the log caught fire a wish for a good year was made, to be more abundantly fulfilled if sparks shot forth. Likewise, in Swiss Ajoie (Bern) the following old song was sung when the *tronche* was kindled:

Que la trontche
Que to bïn ci entreuche;
Fannes ayïnt des affenats,
Ai berbis des aignelats:
Po to lo monde dit bian pain,
Ai di vïn ai thiuvé piain.[42]

Such as this must have been the practice of New Year's morning as described by Benedict in Rome in A.D. 1142 (quoted more fully in n. 24): "de illis frondibus et sale plenam manum proiciunt in ignem et dicunt: 'Tot filii, tot porcelli, tot agni'; et de omnibus bonis optant," although here no mention is made of a kalends log.

Offerings upon the Christmas log were precisely the same sort as those made to the ancient Roman Lares, or in general, to the household gods, namely, grain, wine, food in general, cakes, incense, and salt. Holy water appears in France and in Balkan lands, undoubtedly due

[39] Schneeweis, p. 23, who gives different versions for different localities. See also Davies, "Christmas at Luchitsa" in E. H. Sechrist, *Christmas Everywhere* (Philadelphia, 1936), p. 48. Davies gives the wish as follows: "May you this year have many oxen, many horses, many pigs, many sheep, much honey, all possible good fortune and happiness on this house." Cf. also M. E. Durham, "Burning the Yule Log in Montenegro," *Folk-Lore*, XXVI (1915), 207–8; and Frazer, X, 263–64.

[40] H. Marlot, *Rev. des trad. pop.*, XI (1896), 20–21.

[41] R.-M. Lacuve, *Rev. des trad. pop.*, II (1887), 536. The same was true in Provence, as is evident from the wish "Cachofué ven, tout ben ven."

[42] A. Daucourt, "Noëls jurassiens," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, XII (1908), 125–26. It is astonishing to learn that the Christmas log was known only among the French Swiss, according to that eminent folklorist, E. Hoffmann-Krayer, *Feste und Bräuche des Schweizervolkes* (Zurich, 1913), p. 108.

to ecclesiastical influence. In Italy, at Campli, putting water on the *ceppo* was an impious act—because it quenched the fire.

Martin of Braga bore witness to the offering of grain and wine upon the log in sixth-century Spain. References to offerings in modern Spain and Portugal[43] have not come to light so far, but in France, especially in southern France, where the Christmas log was very popular, offerings of wine and grain were common. In Vienne the father sprinkled the log with salt and water.[44] In Provence the log was blessed by the youngest (according to Mannhardt and Frazer), or by the oldest (according to Flusser), who poured a glass of wine over it, or perhaps three libations, at the same time making a wish: "Cachofué ven, tout ben ven (i.e., le feu caché vient, tout bien vient)."[45] Flusser says the wish was that, if the next year could be no more, it might not be less than the past year. In Marseilles the head of the house kindled the log and sprinkled wine and oil upon it.[46] Such practices, moreover, were not confined to these districts in France, for there are scattered notices about them in numerous places.[47] In Belgium, according to Mannhardt (I, 229), they sang and drank around the log. When it went out, the rest of the wine was thrown upon it. While in England apparently no offering was made upon the log, it was customary to

[43] P. Sartori, *Sitte und Brauch*, III (Leipzig, 1914), 43, n. 99, refers to a log saluted and burned on Christmas Eve in the open space before the church, in Portugal, apparently as a part of the national dance, the *Vito*. In the *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada Europeo-Americana* (Barcelona: Espasa, 1905–33), the *nochebueno* (*s.v.*) is described as a large log of wood that is put on the fire the night of Christmas. At the same time, popular songs are sung, divination is practiced, and stories are told. Unfortunately, no details are given.

[44] Mannhardt, I, 227; Frazer, X, 249–51; Lacuve, p. 536. Of course, there are variations in the person of the one who poured on the offerings—oldest, youngest, or the mistress of the house—but generally the oldest performed the numerous ceremonies. This is especially true in Italy. Perhaps he is the Roman *pater familias*. The head of the house in Hungary laid the log in the fire, according to Kohlbach, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, II (1899), 347. See, in general, Frazer's treatment of the Yule log, X, 246–69.

[45] Mannhardt and Frazer, *loc. cit.*; Flusser, p. 16.

[46] Grimm[4], I, 521; Bilfinger, pp. 57–58; Frazer, *loc. cit.*

[47] See Mannhardt, I, 226–28 and Frazer, X, 249–55, for a description of the log at various other places in France; also the volumes of *Rev. des trad. pop.*, in the indexes, *s.v.* "Coutumes, croyances et superstitions de Noël."

drink beer around it. The log was also thought to bring good luck and ward off evil.[48]

In Italy, at Carpento, among the Monferrini, the *ceppo* was sprinkled with a cup of good wine.[49] Among the Abruzzesi a little of all that was eaten or drunk had to be put into the fire (Ortona a mare), or near the *ceppo* (Laciano and Pescina), or the remnants of the meal were put near the *ceppo* (Francavilla a mare): this was for the *Bambino*,[50] but it is also very much reminiscent of the ancient Lares. Similarly, in Auxois in France it was believed that the Virgin Mary came to warm at the *buche de Noël*, and in the vicinity of Dinan, that the angels came to warm by it,[51] possibly an indication of pagan deities whose place Christian figures had taken.

For southeastern Europe the best and most detailed treatment is by Schneeweis[52] in his excellent monograph on the Christmas customs of the Serbocroatians. The *badnjak* (Christmas log) was the most important characteristic of the South Slavic Christmas celebration. The head of the house brought in the log. After exchange of greetings, the mother of the house strewed grain and nuts over him. Then, after circling the hearth three times, he laid the log on the fire. It was then sprinkled with holy water, incense was burned upon it, wine poured upon it, and offerings of food and money were made to it. The log was saluted in many ways as the symbol of *Fruchtbarkeit* of the new year, for example: "Good afternoon, lucky Christmas-afternoon, lucky *badnjak;* we bring it into our house so that it may bring us in the com-

[48] See Robert Herrick, "Ceremonies for Christmas," in his *Hesperides*, published in 1648; Brand, *Observations on the Popular Antiquities of Great Britain* (London, 1877 [Ellis' ed.]), I, 467 ff.

[49] G. Ferraro, *Superstizioni, use e proverbi Monferrini* (Palermo, 1886), Vol. III of G. Pitrè's *Curiosità populari tradizionali*, p. 36.

[50] Finamore, p. 65.

[51] *Rev. des trad. pop.*, IX (1894), 11, and *ibid.*, XVI (1901), 12. M. Placcucci, *Usi e pregiudizi dei contadini della Romagna*, Vol. I of Pitrè's publication, p. 133, suggests that the kindling of a *zocco* symbolizes the warming of the newborn *Bambino.* See also Frazer, X, 253.

[52] The following facts about the Christmas log among the Serbocroatians are derived from Schneeweis, pp. 16–28, 174–94, but similar treatment may be found in Durham; Davies; Frazier, X, 258–64; Miles, p. 251; Meringer, pp. 152–53. Meringer thinks that, because the Slavic customs were so much like the German, the former must have been borrowed from the latter. But this is extremely unlikely, in my opinion. If anything, the opposite is true.

ing year: Lambs, luck, blessing, health and all the good that we wish for; because of that we give it a fine welcome" (p. 22). This is similar to, or perhaps identical with, the *Funkensegen* when the log is struck. The most common offerings upon the log, as I have said, were wine, a bit of each dish of food, money, honey, butter, the fat of the Christmas swine, peas, raisins, and all sorts of grain, salt, meal—in short, the most common articles of the home, the necessities of good existence, things which the peasant prayed to have in abundance. It was so everywhere in the more Romanized lands where we know the Christmas log to have existed. It is indeed strange that these rites do not appear in the northern lands where the Yule log was known, e.g., England.[53]

It is clear that the offerings upon the Christmas log everywhere were of the same sort as those made by the ancient Romans to the Lares, i.e., grain, wine, incense, food, and other staple articles of the house. Furthermore, these offerings upon the log and the log itself were deemed capable of securing the good luck and prosperity of the family, just as the ancient Lares were believed to produce and safeguard that same prosperity and welfare. Everywhere the log was concerned with the general good fortune. Wishes or prayers were uttered over it for good luck; if the log went out, it indicated bad luck; omens were derived from the way it burned; and, above all, the ashes were powerful charms for fertility and were scattered over the fields for this purpose.[54] The remains of the log were thought in all lands to be par-

[53] I have investigated many volumes dealing with custom, superstition, and folklore, but (as yet) I have found no evidence that the ceremonies over the Christmas log in England and Germany in particular were other than *festive* in character, as I have said. The authors who have dealt with the Christmas log most extensively, i.e., Mannhardt, Frazer, and Schneeweis, not to mention many others who have less to say and who base their statements largely upon Mannhardt, make no mention of rites that can be construed in any way to be similar to those prevalent in lands that once formed the western part of the Roman Empire. Only the superstitions regarding the efficacy of the remains of the Christmas log to ward off lightning, fires, and misfortune in general, and to produce fertility in the fields, etc., seem to be common over all Europe and in England. See also n. 34 above.

[54] Ashes were put in granaries and bins to keep out mice, rats, and other destructive pests, a practice attested for Germany, France, and Italy. In Italy one carried the remains of the *ceppo* into the field, rekindled them, and said: "Tande londane se vède lu foche, tande londane pozza sta serp' e ttope" (Finamore, p. 64). A remote similarity to such practices perhaps is found in Pliny *NH* xxviii. 266–67: "aut si vomerem, quo primus sulcus eo anno in agro ductus sit, excussum aratro focus Larum, quo familia conveniet, urat, lupum nulli animalium nociturum in eo agro quam diu id fiat." Frazer

ticularly efficacious for warding off lightning bolts, storms, and fires.[55] If there is any one most important characteristic of the Christmas log, it is the feeling that the general prosperity and welfare of the family could be influenced by it, or at least determined from the omens taken from it, and I believe that this is precisely what the ancient Romans felt about their Lares. Thus Ennius: "Vosque Lares tectum nostrum qui funditus curant."

In view of all the foregoing argument, I am convinced that elements of the worship of the Lares (and perhaps we should include the Penates and the Genius)[56] have survived down to modern times in the rites just described of the kalends or Christmas log, so popular in the lands over which the western part of the Roman Empire once extended.

EARLHAM COLLEGE

(X, 251) says that in Périgord (in France) the part of the log not burned is used by ploughmen to make a wedge, because it is believed that it causes the seeds to thrive better.

[55] Can it be that here we have surviving a trace of the Roman superstition regarding the power of the laurel to ward off lightning bolts? Frazer (X, 264–65) suggests that, since the Yule log was frequently of oak, this superstition may be a relic of the old Aryan creed which associated the oak tree with the god of thunder. In my opinion, however, this is not a plausible view. The fact that Frazer gives no reference to, or treatment of, the Yule log, or *ceppo*, in Italy seems to invalidate most of his conclusions.

[56] There are many disputed points about the Christmas log itself, but I do not feel that any of them are inconsistent with the argument regarding the *rites*, and their origin, as presented above.

HERODOTUS AND THE NAMES OF EGYPTIAN GODS

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

IT HAS often been noticed that Herodotus speaks of foreign gods, and particularly of Egyptian gods, by Greek names. The assumption generally made seems to be that, as a good Greek, he saw in alien divinities only the gods of his own land in other guises and called by barbarian names and, accordingly, that he made these identifications himself.[1] Certainly, this was often done by Greek writers,[2] and Herodotus was capable of doing it; but his own statements give evidence to suggest that his identifications, in the case of Egyptian gods, have a different source.

He himself tells us, in what appears to be very clear language, that most Greek god-names came from Egypt (ii. 50). This passage must be quoted in full:

> *σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ πάντων τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐλήλυθε ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. διότι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων ἥκει, πυνθανόμενος οὕτω εὑρίσκω ἐόν· δοκέω δ' ὦν μάλιστα ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου ἀπῖχθαι. ὅτι γὰρ δὴ μὴ Ποσειδέωνος καὶ Διοσκόρων, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι ταῦτα εἴρηται, καὶ Ἥρης καὶ Ἱστίης καὶ Θέμιος καὶ Χαρίτων καὶ Νηρηΐδων, τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν Αἰγυπτίοισι αἰεί κοτε τὰ οὐνόματά ἐστι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ. λέγω δὲ τὰ λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι. τῶν δὲ οὔ φασι θεῶν γινώσκειν τὰ οὐνόματα, οὗτοι δέ μοι δοκέουσι ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν ὀνομασθῆναι, πλὴν Ποσειδέωνος· τοῦτον δὲ τὸν θεὸν παρὰ Λιβύων ἐπύθοντο. οὐδαμοὶ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Ποσειδέωνος οὔνομα ἔκτηνται εἰ μὴ Λίβυες καὶ τιμῶσι τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον αἰεί.*

[1] So, e.g., A. Erman, *Die aegyptische Religion*[2] (Berlin, 1909), p. 196.

[2] For the process see A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, I (Cambridge, 1914), 349: "The Greeks in general delighted to trace an analogy, sometimes quite unessential, not to say far-fetched, between their own deities and those of the foreigners among whom they were sojourning. It was a cheer to meet a familiar face in a strange country, even if the garb were outlandish and some of the accessories novel. If the Egyptian Amen was 'King of the Gods,' pious Greeks would regard him as their own Zeus and would readily discover further points of resemblance." For the extent of syncretism in Hellenistic times see W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1905), pp. 7–9.

This is further supplemented by an account of the acceptance of these names in pre-Hellenic Greece (ii. 52):

ἔθυον δὲ πάντα πρότερον οἱ Πελασγοὶ θεοῖσι ἐπευχόμενοι, ὡς ἐγὼ ἐν Δωδώνῃ οἶδα ἀκούσας, ἐπωνυμίην δὲ οὐδ' οὔνομα ἐποιεῦντο οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν. οὐ γὰρ ἀκηκόεσάν κω. θεοὺς δὲ προσωνόμασάν σφεας ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου, ὅτι κόσμῳ θέντες τὰ πάντα πρήγματα καὶ πάσας νομὰς εἶχον. ἔπειτε δὲ χρόνου πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος ἐπύθοντο ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπιγμένα τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἄλλων, Διονύσου δὲ ὕστερον πολλῷ ἐπύθοντο. καὶ μετὰ χρόνον ἐχρηστηριάζοντο περὶ [τῶν] οὐνομάτων ἐν Δωδώνῃ. . . . . ἐπεὶ ὦν ἐχρηστηριάζοντο ἐν τῇ Δωδώνῃ οἱ Πελασγοὶ εἰ ἀνέλωνται τὰ οὐνόματα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἥκοντα, ἀνεῖλε τὸ μαντήιον χρᾶσθαι. ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου ἔθυον τοῖσι οὐνόμασι τῶν θεῶν χρεώμενοι. παρὰ δὲ Πελασγῶν Ἕλληνες ἐδέξαντο ὕστερον.

However, few commentators seem willing to allow that these passages mean what they appear to mean. Meyer,[3] indeed, interprets it literally and concludes that Herodotus, in most cases, heard from his guides only the Greek equivalents of Egyptian god-names, not the Egyptian names themselves. Diels also takes the passage at its face value.[4] To this view we shall return; I believe it is correct, but it is not the accepted one. On the other hand, Stein,[5] Wilkinson,[6] Wiedemann,[7] Wells,[8] and Linforth[9] all argue that *ὄνομα* cannot here mean "name" but must stand for something like the "Begriff der betreffenden Gottheit, wie er sich in ihrer Gestalt, im Cultus und Mythos zeigte."[10] The reason generally given for this interpretation is that

[3] *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, I (Halle, 1892), 194.

[4] "Die Anfänge der Philologie bei den Griechen," *Neue Jahrb.*, XXV (1910), 16. Cf. also W. A. Heidel, "Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XVIII (1935), 103, n. 54: "Herodotus knew the Egyptian names of none except the gods of the Osirid circle: of the others he knew only the names long before given by the Greeks."

[5] *Herodotus*[5] (Berlin, 1883), I, Part II, 60–61.

[6] In G. Rawlinson, *The History of Herodotus*[4] (New York, 1885), II, 80 n.

[7] *Herodots zweites Buch* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 230.

[8] W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*[2] (Oxford, 1928), I, 191.

[9] "Greek Gods and Foreign Gods in Herodotus," *Univ. of California Pub. in Class. Phil.*, IX (1926), 1–25. B. Snell in *Jahresb. für Altert.*, CCXX (1929), 20 indorses Linforth's view, as does Pohlenz in *Herodot* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1937), p. 100.

[10] Wiedemann, *op. cit.*

Herodotus is aware of a difference between Greek and Egyptian names, as for instance when he says (ii. 156) that Horus is Egyptian for Apollo, Isis for Demeter, and Boubastis for Artemis, and that therefore he could not have made such a mistake. This general view has been most fully developed by Professor Linforth. He believes that the names of the gods are used just like common nouns, so that Zeus is merely a translation of Ammon, both denoting the same substance.[11] Naming a god meant giving him an individuality, recognizing him as a being apart. "To name a god was to recognize him as an individual, to learn the name of a god from a foreign people was to learn to recognize him as an individual, whether the actual word used as a name by the foreign people was adopted or a totally different word substituted for it." He gives instances. " 'Melampus taught the Greeks the name of Dionysus'; that is, he introduced the worship of this individual god into Greece. 'The names of all the gods (except those mentioned above) have ever existed in Egypt'; that is, the individual gods have always been distinguished by them."[12] The use of the word, then, apparently means that a name was given, though it may not have been (indeed was not) the Egyptian name.

This view is plausible taken in and by itself; but when applied to passages like ii. 50 and especially ii. 52, I do not believe it will work. Doubtless ὄνομα can mean something *more* than "name," but I cannot see how it can mean anything *less*.[13] The word rings insistently through Herodotus' language at this point (nine times in the two passages quoted, with ὀνομάζειν once) so that if Herodotus means to tell us that the Pelasgians derived from Egypt everything about the gods *except* their names, he is deliberately emphasizing the most misleading of all possible terms. We are told that the Pelasgians had neither name nor "eponym." Herodotus tells us where both came from; the name from Egypt, the "eponym" from Homer and Hesiod (ii. 53). The two terms are contrasted. Homer and Hesiod bestowed on the gods τὰς ἐπωνυμίας . . . . καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας . . . . καὶ εἴδεα—all of which definition goes with, though it is not equivalent to, the

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 11. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[13] Is there any parallel? C. Sourdille, *Hérodote et la religion de l'Egypte* (Paris, 1910), p. 385 n., cites, in another connection, Aeschylus, *Prom.* 211–12: Θέμις, καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφὴ μία. This is a good contrary instance.

"eponym" rather than the name. Then can *ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπιγμένα τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν θεῶν* mean the individuality of gods learned from Egypt and defined by (non-Egyptian) names? When the Pelasgians asked *εἰ ἀνέλωνται τὰ οὐνόματα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἥκοντα*, can this mean that they asked whether they should name and recognize their gods *after the fashion* of the barbarians? And if the naming was essential to the definition of a new god, why was the name which came with him never accepted? Finally, does not the force vanish from a phrase like *οὐ γὰρ ἀκηκόεσάν κω*, unless what they finally did hear was god-names which they applied as they heard them? It seems to me that the interpretation which we are considering transforms a series of precise and emphatic statements into a passage which would have been blurred and ambiguous even to a Greek who knew all the implications of the word *ὄνομα*, and implies a manner of expression which Herodotus could not have chosen.

In the same connection Professor Linforth says that "the ordinary sense of the word is also common enough . . . . but there is no confusion." That there is confusion may perhaps be seen more clearly if we consider the latest translation, that of P. E. Legrand.[14] In ii. 43, in connection with Heracles, he renders *ὄνομα* by "personnage," arguing that Heracles is no Egyptian name. This translation is in accord with the views discussed above. In ii. 50 he also uses "personnage" or "personne" throughout. In ii. 52, however, he translates *ἐπωνυμίην δὲ οὐδ' οὔνομα ἐποιεῦντο οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν* into "sans désigner aucun d'entre eux par un qualicatif ou par un nom personnel" with the remark that here *ὄνομα* has its usual sense The following clause, *οὐ γὰρ ἀκηκόεσάν κω*, is rendered "car ils n'avaient encore rien entendu de pareil." Here "rien de pareil" seems gratuitous and embarrassed. The object to be supplied for *ἀκηκόεσάν* is, of course, *οὔνομα*, and if *οὔνομα* means name, the clause means that the Pelasgians did not use names because they had never heard them; but this fact is glossed over in the translation. For the other four occurrences of the word in this passage, Legrand uses "désignation" or "désignation individuelle." Now "désignation" seems ambiguous. Either it really is the equivalent of "nom" or it means "personnage." If it is intended for "nom," then the passage is clear; but what it *means* is that the Pelasgians never heard of god-

[14] *Hérodote* Vol. II (Paris, 1936).

names until they heard them from Egypt; that they consulted Dodona about these *names;* that the oracle told them to use, and that they did use, the *names* of the gods (τοῖσι οὐνόμασι τῶν θεῶν) which came from Egypt. If, on the other hand, "désignation" is intended for "personnage," then there is no consistency. What the Pelasgians had never heard was names; what they ultimately got, and used, was not names but something else, and not only the contrast between ὄνομα and ἐπωνυμίη but the coherence of the whole account is destroyed. I submit that a careful reading of the passage will show, first, that ὄνομα has the same meaning throughout and, second, that in its first occurrence it means (as Legrand says it does) "name."

From this analysis I hope the conclusion will emerge that the only way to get a clear account out of this passage is to accept the ordinary meaning of ὄνομα throughout. Let us now consider the whole matter on the hypothesis that Herodotus really means what he obviously seems to say.

In general, Herodotus has two ways of speaking of foreign gods. He often gives the name of a Greek god, whom he equates with the foreign god, mentioning the foreign name also.[15] Thus when he lists for us the names of the Scythian gods (iv. 59) he gives them in both languages; the Scythian name of Histia is Tabiti, of Zeus, Papaeus, etc. Here, whether it be the historian or his Greco-Scythian informant who has made the identification, it is clear that we have the result of a conscious process, and the same is true when we find that Aphrodite is called Mylitta by the Assyrians, Alilat by the Arabians, and Mitra by the Persians (i. 131) or when he speaks of Baal-Marduk as Zeus Belus (iii. 158). On the other hand, there are cases when he calls the foreign god simply by a Greek god-name, as if that were what the barbarians themselves called him. Thus no native name is given for the Scythian (iv. 59, 62) or the Thracian (v. 7) Ares; for the Thracian Dionysus (v. 7) or the Dionysus whose oracle was among the Bessi (vii. 111); for the Thracian Artemis (v. 7); or for the Persian Zeus (i. 131; cf. vii. 8 γ, etc.). In all these cases, it is possible that the reason he did not give foreign names to correspond to these Greek ones is that he was unaware that they existed. The principle that,

[15] These cases are fully tabulated by Linforth, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–7.

wherever Herodotus knows of a foreign name for a god, he gives it, is of course not demonstrable, but it might possibly be correct.

When we come to the Egyptian gods, we seem to find the same two ways of speaking. The Egyptians say Osiris is Dionysus (ii. 42); Ὄσιρις δέ ἐστι Διόνυσος κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν (ii. 144). So also Apollo and Horus (ii. 144, 156), Artemis and Boubastis (ii. 137, 156), Demeter and Isis (ii. 59, 156), Zeus and Ammon (ii. 42), Pan and Mendes (ii. 46) are equated. However, no non-Greek names are mentioned for Athene (ii. 28, 59, 83, 169, 170, 175), Ares (ii. 59, 63, 83), Aphrodite (ii. 41), Heracles (ii. 42–45, 83, 113, 145), Hephaestus (ii. 2, 3, 99, etc.), Hermes (ii. 138), Leto (ii. 59, 83, 155, 156), Selene (ii. 47), or Typhon (ii. 144, 156; iii. 5). Yet this is strange when he is at such pains to show us the identity of (for instance) Dionysus and Osiris, just as it is rather surprising that he gives us the Assyrian, Arabian, and Persian names for Aphrodite without mentioning the Egyptian. Some of these unequated gods have proved puzzling. Wiedemann[16] confesses that he cannot understand why Hephaestus should ever have been identified with Ptah and refuses to believe that any similarity of names is responsible. The Egyptian counterpart of Ares is uncertain.[17] It is odd that Herodotus should calmly make these difficult identifications without a word of explanation or argument.

The Egyptian Heracles is still more troublesome. It is not clear which Egyptian god the name stands for.[18] He is not even the same as the Greek Heracles, for he is one of the "twelve gods" while the Greek is a hero born of a mortal mother (ii. 43). Now this means that here, at least, Herodotus did not call by the name "Heracles" an Egyptian god who seemed, under an Egyptian name, to be the same as the Greek hero; for he obviously saw that they were not the same. The name is the link. There cannot, in fact, be any other explanation of this identification than that Herodotus believed that the Egyptian was actually called Heracles and that it was an Egyptian name. This

[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 397. For the Egyptian counterparts of these gods in general cf. Sourdille, *op. cit.*

[17] Cf. Wiedemann, *op. cit.*, p. 264; How and Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 197–98; Sourdille, *op. cit.*, pp. 185–92.

[18] Cf. Wiedemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 200–201; Sourdille, *op. cit.*, pp. 172–76.

is admitted by Wiedemann[19] and Wells[20] as well as by others,[21] though not by Legrand[22] or Linforth;[23] but this is to admit that, in at least one case, an Egyptian god-*name* did come to the Greeks, who generally failed to recognize it as such.[24] If Herodotus thought Heracles was an Egyptian name, he might also have thought that other gods in Egypt were called Aphrodite, Ares, Athene, Hephaestus, Hermes, Leto, Selene, Typhon, for the simple and excellent reason that his informants, priests of Hephaestus[25] or others, gave him only their Greek equivalents and, out of kindness to the stranger, never burdened him with Neith, Ptah, and Thoth.[26]

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 205. [20] *Op. cit.*, p. 187.

[21] E.g., T. R. Glover, *Herodotus* (Berkeley, 1924), p. 275; Zwicker in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *R-E*, *s.v.* "Herakles."

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 96 n. [23] *Op. cit.*, pp. 13–14.

[24] Here again (ii. 43) Herodotus emphasizes the name: *καὶ μὲν ὅτι γε οὐ παρ' Ἑλλήνων ἔλαβον τὸ οὔνομα Αἰγύπτιοι [τοῦ Ἡρακλέος] ἀλλ' Ἕλληνες μᾶλλον παρ' Αἰγυπτίων . . . . . πολλά μοι καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήριά ἐστι τοῦτο οὕτω ἔχειν, ἐν δὲ καὶ τόδε . . . . . καὶ διότι Αἰγύπτιοι οὔτε Ποσειδέωνος οὔτε Διοσκόρων τὰ οὐνόματά φασι εἰδέναι, οὐδέ σφι θεοὶ οὗτοι ἐν τοῖσι ἄλλοισι θεοῖσι ἀποδεδέχαται. καὶ μὲν εἴ γε παρ' Ἑλλήνων ἔλαβον οὔνομά τευ δαίμονος, τούτων οὐκ ἥκιστα ἀλλὰ μάλιστα ἔμελλον μνήμην ἕξειν . . . . ὥστε τούτων ἂν καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν θεῶν τὰ οὐνόματα ἐξεπιστέατο Αἰγύπτιοι ἢ τοῦ Ἡρακλέος.* The argument is that had the Egyptians learned any god-names from the Greeks, they must have known of Poseidon and the Dioscuri; but they did not. Linforth holds, rightly I think, that Herodotus corrected the faulty chronology in this case because he was convinced before hand of the identity. Herodotus' conclusion is that "there are really two divinities, one a god named Heracles and known both to Greeks and to Egyptians, and the other a hero, named after the god and known only to the Greeks." But, if Herodotus could here distinguish between two Greek gods of the same name, could he not have distinguished between, and doubted the identification of, a Greek and an Egyptian god who did not have the same name? I cannot see why he was so certain of this identification unless it was guaranteed by the name.

[25] For the Egyptian informants of Herodotus cf. F. Jacoby in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *R-E*, *s.v.* "Herodotus," cols. 426–29. Those who gave him this information were presumably Egyptians, not Greeks. Probably the "priests" of Hephaestus were responsible for a great deal (cf. How and Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 422), though he may have got information from other sources; e.g., about Neith-Athene from her "financial secretary" at Sais (ii. 28). For the view (to which I cannot subscribe) that Herodotus' chief source of information for such matters was the work of Hecataeus, cf. Heidel, *op. cit.*

[26] Cf. Meyer, *op. cit.:* "Bei dieser völligen Unkenntniss des Aegyptischen wird es verständlich, dass Herodot allen Ernstes behaupten kann, die Namen der meisten griechischen Götter stammten aus Aegypten und seien hier zu allen Zeiten gebräuchlich gewesen (II, 43, 50). Er hat eben die meisten einheimischen Namen (ausser Isis Osiris Horos Buto Ammon u.a.) von seinen Führern nie gehört, sondern nur ihre seit langem gangbaren griechischen Aequivalente."

We now come to the objection noted above. What of the gods who carry both Greek and Egyptian names? Why, if Herodotus thought Dionysus was an Egyptian name, does he say (ii. 144) that Osiris is called Dionysus, as Horus is called Apollo, in *Greek?* The answer appears to be fairly simple. A god may have more than one name; if Osiris and Dionysus were to Herodotus alternate Egyptian names for the same divinity, he had no occasion to be surprised if only one of them was current in Greece.[27] That this was the case seems to be confirmed by the way in which he speaks of the transmission of the cult of Dionysus from Egypt to Hellas: *Ἕλλησι γὰρ δὴ Μελάμπους ἐστὶ ὁ ἐξηγησάμενος τοῦ Διονύσου τό τε οὔνομα καὶ τὴν θυσίην καὶ τὴν πομπὴν τοῦ φαλλοῦ* (ii. 49); for here the name and the cult and the ritual are kept distinct, and, though the cult was not transmitted with perfect accuracy, there is no question about the name. So also in the statement *καὶ διότι Αἰγύπτιοι οὔτε Ποσειδέωνος οὔτε Διοσκόρων τὰ οὐνόματά φασι εἰδέναι οὐδέ σφι θεοὶ οὗτοι ἐν τοῖσι ἄλλοισι θεοῖσι ἀποδεδέχαται* (ii. 43) there is a distinction between recognizing a god and knowing his name. Further, Herodotus, writing for Greeks, never speaks of an important foreign god without giving him a name familiar to Greeks; so he explains the less familiar Osiris by the more familiar Dionysus, without prejudicing the ultimately Egyptian origin of the latter. The same reasoning will apply to Horus-Apollo, Isis-Demeter, and the rest.[28]

If Herodotus really thought that Dionysus, Apollo, Demeter, as well as Heracles, Hephaestus, and Ares were genuine Egyptian names for Egyptian gods, the confusion vanishes from his whole account of the Greek religious inheritance from Egypt. In ii. 50 and 52 he means precisely what he says. And his reasons for so thinking are clear. In the first place, he was specifically told so on what he considered high

[27] Diels (*op. cit.*) suggests that the Greeks of the Delta coupled some god-names to make double names like Pan-Mendes.

[28] In ii. 50 the names of the other gods are thought to have been conferred by the Pelasgians, but Poseidon is given a Libyan origin (cf. also iv. 180, 188). The literal interpretation of this statement stands or falls with the interpretation of the rest of the paragraph. As for Athene of Tritonis (iv. 180, 188), I should suggest that Herodotus never heard a native name, but gave her, as he gave her panoply, an Egyptian origin (iv. 180).

authority—by the wise Egyptians themselves.[29] *λέγω δὲ τὰ λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι* (ii. 50). This was confirmed by his experience of gods revealed to him *only* under such familiar names as Athene and Heracles. Such a striking coincidence could only mean that the names came from Egypt. From this point of view, irrevocably prejudiced, Herodotus tried to approach the matter critically, and his speculations about the bringing of Dionysus by Melampus (ii. 49) or of Demeter's mysteries by the Danaids (ii. 171) combined with his information from Dodona[30] merely reaffirmed a conclusion already accepted. The result of this reasoning is plain. The identity of the Greek and Egyptian gods is accepted as a matter of course, despite discrepancies in cult and representation, because it is guaranteed by the name; while the identity and origin of the names is stated in the clearest language he knew how to use.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

[29] Evidently at this time the Egyptians knew more about Greece than Greeks did about Egypt. And it is not surprising that a people once masters of the world should put forth a claim to be masters in the only field now left open to them—in religion. And this was a claim supported by their impressive antiquity in the face of newcomers like the Greeks. Linforth (*op. cit.*) argues convincingly that the identifications were generally made not by Herodotus but by his Egyptian informants.

[30] This is not too surprising in view of the acknowledged Egyptian affinities at Dodona (cf. Cook, *op. cit.*, pp. 363–71). Since I have dealt only with the question of what Herodotus thought, it has not seemed necessary to consider the validity of syncretism in general or the true origin of this or that Hellenic god.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THREE NOTES ON THE REIGN OF MARCUS CLAUDIUS TACITUS

The brief reign of the Roman emperor Tacitus (A.D. 275–76) has been of interest to historians because of its chronological and source problems and also because of the alleged revival of senatorial prestige for which Tacitus, himself a senator, was supposed to have been responsible. Although the chronology and sources for the reign have been exhaustively studied,[1] the question of the real position of the senate under Tacitus deserves some further elaboration.

I

Some scholars have held that under Tacitus the senate recovered certain powers which it had lost in the time of Gallienus and Aurelian; others have denied that such a recovery took place. Leon Homo,[2] the foremost proponent of the senatorial revival theory, holds that the senate recovered the electoral, judicial, administrative, and military privileges which it had lost in the course of the third century. N. H. Baynes,[3] on the other hand, finds no evidence in support of Homo's theory. The same negative attitude is taken by J. G. C. Anderson[4] and G. M. Bersanetti.[5]

Nevertheless, the correct answer to the question seems to lie between the two extremes represented by Homo and Baynes. There is no evidence, with the exception of the unsubstantiated (and therefore suspect) statements of the *Vita Taciti* (xii, xviii–xix), which would indicate that the senate recovered many of its former prerogatives. The transfer of judicial appeal to the prefect of the city and the recovery of proconsular commands mentioned in letters

[1] A. Stein, "Zur Chronologie der römischen Kaiser," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, VII (1923), 46–51. Stein dates the accession of Tacitus in October or November of 275, his death in May or June, 276. For the sources see E. Hohl, "Vopiscus und die Biographie des Kaisers Tacitus," *Klio*, XI (1911), 178–229, 284–324.

[2] "Les Privilèges administratifs du sénat romain sous l'empire et leur disparition graduelle au cours du III^{e} siècle," *Revue historique*, CXXXVII (1921), 162–203; CXXXVIII (1921), 1–52; *Les Institutions politiques romaines* (Paris, 1927), pp. 288–332.

[3] "Three Notes on the Reforms of Diocletian and Constantine," *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XV (1925), 195–98.

[4] "The Genesis of Diocletian's Provincial Reorganization," *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXII (1932), 24–32.

[5] "La Pretesa restaurazione senatoria dell'imperatore Tacito," *Rivista indo-greco-italica di filologia lingua antichità*, XIX (1935), 19–24.

quoted by the *Vita Taciti* (xviii–xix) cannot be accepted as historical facts.[6] The military posts from which the senators were excluded by Gallienus were not restored to them.[7] The electoral privilege—the privilege of nominating the emperor—was exercised only in the case of Tacitus, which was an unusual one.[8]

On the other hand, it can be said that Tacitus went as far as he dared (in favoring the senate) in the face of the possible opposition of the military non-senatorial group. Although Aurelian was deified, no doubt in deference to the wishes of the army, Tacitus did not follow Aurelian's autocratic policy. Tacitus did not take the title *deus et dominus*,[9] nor did he publicly espouse Aurelian's favorite deity, the sun-god.[10]

Homo and Baynes agree that the senate under Tacitus did not recover the right to strike bronze coins—a privilege which had been taken away by Aurelian. Nevertheless, the familiar SC appears on aurei of Tacitus minted at Rome, Cyzicus, and Antioch.[11] Under Florian, the half-brother and successor of Tacitus, the SC also appears on asses minted at Rome.[12] It is possible, therefore, that Tacitus and Florian intended to return this particular privilege to the senate.

Support for a belief in a modest revival of senatorial prestige is provided by archeological evidence: inscriptions and coins. On one stele Tacitus is called VERAE LIBERTATIS AVCTOR (*CIL*, XII, 5563); this is paralleled in the coin legend LIBERTAS AVG. (Cohen 54). When Tacitus is called PIISSIMVS in another dedication (*EE*, VII, 629), we may well suspect that this epithet refers to his treatment of the senate. Moreover, the coin legend SECVRITAS P.R. (Cohen 133) is highly significant; Cohen (107) also notes a medallion (the existence of which cannot now be verified) with the legend RESTITVT. REIPVBLICAE.

It seems logical to conclude that Tacitus favored the senate in every possible way, in everything that did not conflict with the interests and prerogatives of the military group. No doubt the senate was consulted regarding

[6] Homo himself has shown that the letters quoted in the Augustan History have no historical value ("Les Documents de l'histoire Auguste et leur valeur historique," *Revue historique*, CLI [1926], 161–98; CLII [1926], 1–31).

[7] Baynes, *op. cit.*, pp. 196 ff.

[8] It will be remembered that the murder of Aurelian was followed by a brief interregnum. The army hesitated to nominate a princeps, and the senate was allowed to select Tacitus.

[9] This title was revived by Tacitus' successors, Probus and Carus. See the coins of Probus (Mattingly and Sydenham, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, V, 2, No. 885) and Carus (*ibid.*, Nos. 96–100).

[10] There are no *Sol invictus* coins of Tacitus, nor are there any other coins of his reign which bear legends referring to the Sun cult.

[11] Mattingly and Sydenham, *op. cit.*, V, 1, Nos. 75, 205, 209.

[12] *Ibid.*, Nos. 51–55.

matters of policy, and it is conceivable that the senate acted as a legislative body. Tacitus could not with safety to himself, however, restore to the senate the judicial, military, and administrative powers which had passed into the hands of the military faction.

II

There is another aspect of the reign of Tacitus which is extremely interesting. It seems probable that Tacitus saw a remarkable parallel between his historical position and that of Nerva. Both Nerva and Tacitus were elderly senators who succeeded autocratically inclined rulers; the reigns of Nerva and Tacitus were notable for a revival of senatorial prestige. Domitian and Aurelian had taken the title *deus et dominus;* the use of this title was discontinued by Nerva and Tacitus. The emphasis on *libertas* under Tacitus seems more than a coincidence when one recalls the famous remark of the historian Tacitus that Nerva reconciled liberty and the principate.[13]

It may have been an act of conscious archaism when Tacitus took his second grant of the tribunician power on December 10, 275, instead of waiting until the anniversary of his accession as was the common practice in the third century.[14] In other words, Tacitus reverted to second-century practice, evidently believing that this represented a return to ancient custom in force in the time of Nerva.

III

The work of Hohl on the *Vita Taciti* has already been mentioned.[15] Hohl found that the biographer had ranged far afield to find material to pad his meager account of Tacitus' reign. Some of this material was borrowed and adapted from the *Histories* of the historian Tacitus; it was employed by the biographer to make up the obviously fictitious speeches to be found in

[13] *Agricola* iii. 1.

[14] In the third century the emperors renewed their tribunician power on the anniversaries of their accessions: H. Mattingly, "Tribunicia potestate," *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XX (1930), 78–91; T. Jones, "A Chronological Problem: The Date of the Death of Carus," *Amer. Jour. Philol.*, LIX (1938), 338–42. In the case of Tacitus, however, we have the following chronology:

Date	Tribunician Power	Office	Source
Autumn 275	I	Proconsul	*CIL*, II, 4638, 4830
	I	Consul I	Cohen 84
	I	Consul designatus II	Cohen 85
Dec. 10, 275	II	Consul I	*CIL*, II, 4635, 4636
	II	Proconsul	*Ibid.*, 4879
Jan. 1, 276	II	Consul II	*Ibid.*, XII, 5563 Cohen 164

[15] See above, n. 1.

chapters iii, v, and vi of the *Vita Taciti*.[16] The works of the panegyrists were also plundered.[17]

Some addition to Hohl's discoveries might be suggested. The biographer appreciated the parallels which Tacitus himself apparently saw between his reign and that of Nerva. Thus, it is not surprising to find that some sections of the *Vita Taciti* are faintly reminiscent of Cassius Dio's account of Nerva's reign. When Tacitus in a speech (*Vita Taciti* iv. 5) emphasizes his old age and infirmity, we recall Cassius Dio (*Epitome*) lxviii. 1. 3 and 3. 4. Again, *Vita Taciti* vi. 8–9 may perhaps be modeled after Cassius Dio (*Epitome*) lxviii. 4. 1–2.

The passage from the *Vita Taciti* (vi. 8–9) to which reference has just been made demands closer attention. It is the latter portion of a senatorial speech in which Tacitus is urged to adopt a competent man as his successor (following the example of Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian) rather than to bequeath the Roman Empire to his young sons. There are two reasons for believing this speech a mere fabrication of the biographer.

1. We have no other evidence that Tacitus had any male children. Moreover, considering the fact that Tacitus was over seventy years of age at this time, it is doubtful that his sons, if he had any, were young.

2. It seems almost certain that it was well understood that Florian, Tacitus' half-brother and pretorian prefect, was to succeed him. The *Vita Taciti* (v. 2) carries a hint of this: "Habes . . . . bonum fratrem." We also know that when Tacitus died Florian succeeded him with the consent of the senate (Zonaras xii. 29) and the western provinces (Zosimus i. 64).[18] Although the common source of the *Vita Taciti* (xiv. 1) and Victor (*De Caesaribus* xxxvi. 2) accused Florian of seizing the imperial power without the consent of the senate or the army, it is more than likely that this common source was favorable to Probus and sought to justify Probus' usurpation.

Thus, if, as it seems, the passage from the *Vita Taciti* (vi. 8–9) is mere fabrication, then we must conclude that it was inspired by Cassius Dio's narrative or by similar remarks about Nerva's adoption of Trajan made by another author.

TOM B. JONES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE WORK OF ANTONINUS PIUS AT ANTIOCH

The sixth-century chronicler John Malalas, who used earlier sources which were often evidently of great value, ascribes to Antoninus Pius building activities in various Eastern cities, including Antioch, which apparently should be attributed to Caracalla. The problem which is thus raised has been de-

[16] Hohl, *op. cit.*, pp. 290–93. [17] *Ibid.*, pp. 290–91.

[18] Of course there are also numerous inscriptions and coins of Florian as emperor.

bated so much that it is not necessary to examine it in detail here; it is possible, however, to add to the discussion two points which seem to be of importance.

Malalas relates[1] that Pius built in Heliopolis in Phoenice a temple of Zeus and in Laodicea in Syria the forum and a public bath; he also conducted a campaign against the Egyptians, who had killed the augustalis, and after putting down the disorder went to Alexandria and built a *dromos* and two gates. Then, going to Antioch, he paved the streets of the city, at his own expense, as he wrote in an inscription (which Malalas says "still exists") placed at the gate where the work was begun. The emperor also built baths at Caesarea in Palestine and at Nicomedia and Ephesus; and, returning to Rome, he built an aqueduct.

This account awakened suspicion because there is no good evidence that Pius made such a journey, and F. Schehl[2] has made an extensive investigation of it, in which he has shown that there is no evidence for the attribution of some of these activities to Pius, while there is every reason to ascribe them to Caracalla. Malalas might, he pointed out, confuse the emperors because of the similarity of their names (in the only passage in which the chronicler names Caracalla, he calls him Antoninus Caracallus [295. 11]), and Caracalla is known from other evidence to have visited both Alexandria and Antioch. A. Boulanger[3] and J. Vogt[4] pointed out, however, that Pius could have carried out his work at Alexandria and Antioch without visiting the cities and that Malalas might have inferred, from knowledge of such work, that the visits had taken place; and A. Schenk von Stauffenberg[5] adduces evidence that Malalas inferred or invented such visits in connection with the building activities of other emperors. The questions of the journey and of the confusions of names are thus quite distinct.

Parts of Malalas' account, nevertheless, certainly refer to Pius, and in some instances the evidence for the attribution of these activities to Pius or Caracalla is either lacking or inconclusive; it is particularly difficult to decide the attribution of the work at Alexandria. There is likewise no conclusive independent evidence concerning the ascription of the paving of the streets at Antioch, and the solution of this part of the question must depend, apparent-

[1] P. 280, ll. 8 ff. in the Bonn edition, cited from the text of A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die röm. Kaisergesch. bei Malalas: Griech. Text der Bücher IX–XII und Untersuch.* (Stuttgart, 1931).

[2] "Untersuchungen zur Gesch. des Kaisers Antoninus Pius," *Hermes*, LXV (1930), 177–208. On the revolt in Egypt to which Malalas refers see O. W. Reinmuth, "The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian," *Klio*, Beiheft XXXIV (1935), 69.

[3] *Aelius Aristide* (Paris, 1923), p. 484.

[4] *Die alexandrinischen Münzen*, I (Stuttgart, 1924), 128.

[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 307–18. These aspects of Malalas' sources and methods are discussed in detail in the present writer's article, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," *Byz. Ztschr.*, XXXVIII (1938), 1–15, 299–311; see also Schehl, *ibid.*, pp. 157–69.

ly, on the interpretation of the remainder of the passage. Stauffenberg[6] prefers to accept the attribution of the work at Antioch to Pius, pointing out that the biography of Pius in the *Historia Augusta* (ix. 2) records a fire at Antioch which might have occasioned the work which Malalas describes; Pausanias also mentions the emperor's public works in Syria (viii. 43. 4). Stauffenberg's arguments are not, however, as W. Ensslin[7] points out, entirely convincing, for he insists that a confusion of the names of Pius and Caracalla could not occur in the chronicle of Antioch, from which the account of the work there would have been taken, while at the same time he accepts Schehl's conclusions that some of the work elsewhere was done by Pius and that the names were confused. W. Hüttl[8] agrees with Stauffenberg in the case of the work at Antioch (while accepting Schehl's belief that some of the work elsewhere is to be attributed to Pius), and W. Weber[9] has pronounced in favor of the retention of the work for Pius.

One point of some weight in this connection has hitherto been overlooked. Malalas says that the work of Pius at Antioch was recorded in an inscription which still existed in his own day and states the contents of the inscription (281. 5). This has been accepted as evidence that Malalas saw such an inscription, and his belief that it recorded work of Pius has been either accepted or rejected and explained away by the supposition that he misunderstood Caracalla's name. Such evidence cannot, however, be accepted without the greatest reservation, for Malalas almost certainly followed the general ancient practice of citing inscriptions from literary sources: he often quotes or cites inscriptions which cannot have existed or have been authentic, and he sometimes expressly quotes from literary sources statements that inscriptions and other monuments "still exist."[10]

Other evidence which seems to have a bearing on this problem has been brought out in an article by the writer.[11] When Septimius Severus punished Antioch for its support of Pescennius Niger, his punishment included the removal of the Olympic games of Antioch to Cilicia and their amalgamation or association with games held there in commemoration of Severus' victory at Issus. Malalas states that the games were restored to Antioch by Diocletian, but there is evidence in Malalas himself that they were restored by Caracalla. The new evidence for the restoration of the games by Caracalla, of course,

[6] *Loc. cit.*

[7] In his review of Stauffenberg (*Phil. Woch.*, LIII [1933], 774).

[8] *Antoninus Pius*, I (Prag, 1936), 290, n. 356.

[9] *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, XI (1936), 333.

[10] See the writer's article, "References to Inscriptions in the Chronicle of Malalas," *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, LXVI (1935), 55–72.

[11] "Malalas on the History of Antioch under Severus and Caracalla," *ibid.*, LXVIII (1937), 141–56. See also the writer's article, "The Political Status of Roman Antioch," to appear in *Berytus*, Vol. VI.

does not necessarily add any proof that the paving of the streets at Antioch was executed by him, any more than his visit to the city or his apparent liking for it or his passion for building, prove that he restored the games or paved the streets. The evidence connected with the games does, however, contribute to our knowledge of Caracalla's relations to Antioch and adds something to the grounds for the belief that he might have paved the streets. The deficiency of Malalas' information concerning the reign of Caracalla which is suggested by the apparent disappearance from his source of the record of the resumption of the games under Caracalla, may help to account for his confusion of Pius with Caracalla and for his attribution to Pius' reign of events which took place under Caracalla.

GLANVILLE DOWNEY

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

ANALOGUES OF THE HERCYNIAN ELKS

In the *Classical Weekly*, XXIII (1930), 93–94, Dr. E. S. McCartney presents certain parallels to Caesar's account (*BG* vi. 27) of elks with jointless legs found in the Hercynian Forest. Some additional notes upon this theme[1] may be in order.

Aristotle (*De incessu anim.* 709 *a* 10) attacks an old but erroneous account of the movement of elephants which asserted that the elephant had no knee-joints (cf. also *op. cit.* 712 *a* 11), and in *Hist. anim.* 2. 498 *a* 8, he states that "the elephant does not sleep standing, as some were wont to assert, but it bends its knees and settles down; only that in consequence of its weight it cannot bend its legs on both sides simultaneously, but falls into a recumbent position on one side or the other, and in this position it goes to sleep" (Thompson's translation). The author of the incorrect views here attacked by Aristotle is perhaps Ctesias of Cnidus, in the early fourth century, the inaccuracy of whose statements about elephants Aristotle further notes in *De gen. anim.* 2. 736 *a* 3, but whose work on India was much used by ancient zoölogists and writers on marvels, known to Diodorus (whom Dr. McCartney cites on elephants with jointless knees), and very likely influencing the passage which he cites from Strabo (xvi. 4. 10; cf. Jacoby in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, XI [1922] 2037). This incorrect statement about elephants, moreover, reappears in another Cnidian writer, Agatharchides, in the second century B.C., as preserved in Photius *Bibl.* cod. 250. 25 (*Patr. Gr.*, CIV, 48), and is found also in Solinus xx. 7; Ambrose *Hexaemeron* vi. 5. 31–32; and Cassiodorus *Variae* x. 30. 1–2; cf. Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia epidemica*, III, 1. The jointless legs of the *alces* (or the *achlis*) are found also in Pliny *NH* viii. 39 and Solinus, *loc. cit.* Further, the wild men among the Mongols described by Johannes de Plano Carpini (cf. the 1905 edition of Sir John Mandeville, p. 223) had no

[1] Also discussed by J. M. Rife in *Class. Jour.*, XXX (1935), 429–31.

joints in the legs,[2] and, when they had fallen, could not rise without assistance. Thus from the elephant tales of the marvel-loving Ctesias the motif seems to have extended to the elk and, finally, to human beings.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE KNEELING YOUTH OF THE AGORA

In *Hesperia*, VI (1937), 426–41, Plate X, Figures 1–9, Eugene Vanderpool discusses Agora Inventory P 1231, an archaic terra cotta vase nearly 10 inches in height, modeled in the form of a youthful kneeling fillet-binder. The date is set by the author at about 540–535 B.C.

Two points of particular interest relate to the figure: (1) it is the earliest Greek example of a sculptured fillet-binder; (2) the pose is unique—the torso is erect and the weight is borne by the knees and the toes which are bent forward at right angles to the soles of the feet. Vanderpool correctly explains this attitude as occasioned by a practical consideration—the necessity for providing a substantial base for the vessel which probably possessed the function of an oil-holder. But his judgment that the fillet-binder is a victorious athlete (p. 438) is hardly convincing. He realizes the difficulty when he grants that (p. 437) "the regular attitude for a fillet-binder was standing."

I feel that a Greek artist—particularly one of a date as early as this vase represents—would have found it impossible to depict a victor in an attitude that strongly suggests *proskynesis*, even if a practical base had to be provided. The incongruity of the situation would have immediately been patent to him. The Hellenistic "fountain-figure" was still far in the future.

When I examined the vase in the Agora House shortly after its discovery, I noticed the pronounced downward turn of the gaze. This suggested to me Narkissos admiring his reflection in the spring. Such an understanding provides a better motivation in the figure than the idea of an Olympic victor. Narkissos kneels for the sake of a better view of his own charms.

The business of identifying Narkissos in ancient art is a notoriously hazardous one, and many sculptured forms of youths formerly regarded as Narkissoi have been shown to harmonize better with the classical conception of Hyakinthos, Adonis, Hylas, or even Dionysos. The most recent list of genuine, or presumably genuine, likenesses of Narkissos has been compiled by S. Eitrem in his article in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll (*R.E.*, XVI [1935], 1721–33). None of these seems to be earlier than the fourth century. If the Agora vase-figure is an authentic Narkissos, it is the earliest, *magno intervallo*, now extant. As a sixth-century creation it lacks, as might be expected, the sentimental and tragic elements of the Hellenistic conception of Narkissos.

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

[2] Cf. what Augustine says (*CD* xvi. 8) of the Sciopodes.

ASSUMED CONTRADICTION IN THE PARENTAGE OF ARETE

In the *Odyssey* (vii. 55 f.) it is said that Arete and Alcinous, her husband, were born of the same parents τοκήων τῶν αὐτῶν.

When the poet gives the family tree of the king and his wife, it is shown that she was the daughter of a deceased brother of Alcinous, hence she was a niece and not a sister of her husband. This seeming contradiction has been the occasion of much conjecture and of many charges of poetic addition and manipulation. These charges are accepted in principle in the edition of Ameis-Hentze, which has this note:

> So dass Arete die Schwester des Alkinoos war. Damit befindet sich aber die 63–66 folgende Erzählung im Widerspruch, nach der sie seines Bruders Tochter war. Es ist annehmbar, dass dort die Hand eines Interpolators eingegriffen hat, der an der Geschwisterehe Anstoss nahm.

It is well known that in Athens the marriage of an uncle with his niece was a common and approved connection, but the marriage of brother with sister was regarded as incest. Homer does have traces of this incestuous marriage, as is shown in the case of Zeus and Hera, also in the marriage of the sons with the daughters of Aeolus. The assumption of the critics is that in the original form of the *Odyssey* Arete was the sister of her husband, but later a different moral feeling prevailed, and some interpolator deftly changed her from the sister to the niece of Alcinous. However, the words τοκήων τῶν αὐτῶν do not involve any contradiction with the subsequent narrative, which reveals her as the daughter of a brother of Alcinous and not his own sister, as these two quotations from Isaeus will show.

Isaeus (vii. 20) quotes the law of inheritance as follows: κρατεῖν δὲ τοὺς ἄρρενας καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀρρένων, οἳ ἂν ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν ὦσι. κἂν γένει ἀπωτέρω τυγχάνωσι ὄντες. Here sons, grandsons, and even great grandsons are all regarded as being from τῶν αὐτῶν; this exactly covers the relationship of Arete and Alcinous, one was a grandchild, the other a child, but they were both sprung from τοκήων τῶν αὐτῶν.

Isaeus (viii. 32) defines the word "parents," γονεῖς, as follows: "By parents we mean father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, and even the parents of these, if they are still alive." Hence in Homer, even if the parents of Alcinous were the grandparents of Arete, yet in the case of each the word "parents" was properly used. Thus in the strictest legal sense they were of the same parents, τοκήων τῶν αὐτῶν, although one was the uncle and the other the niece. There is then no contradiction and no reason for the assumption of the hand of an interpolator.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geb. By FRANZ HAMPL. ("Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der Fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig," 54.) Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1938. Pp. 144. Rm. 6.

This work is devoted not to a general study of treaties but to an examination of those particular treaties that provided for a *koine eirene* or general peace. In the first part the juridical form and contents of individual treaties are discussed; in the second part, their historical importance. This is followed by a special section devoted to the Second Athenian League. It is thus clear that the author has dealt with a complicated subject on which a mass of literature has been produced in recent years and one which involves several points for which there are almost as many interpretations as there are writers.

The introductory statement distinguishing between treaties of the *koine eirene* type and ordinary treaties of peace (*spondai*) that served to bring hostilities to an end amounts to a challenge of the widely accepted theory of Keil. It is maintained that the expiration of *spondai* concluded for thirty or fifty years did not automatically restore a state of war; renewal of hostilities required a new declaration of war. Thus the conclusion of a treaty for a limited period did not mean that peace was made for a limited period, but that for the duration of the treaty additional obligations were imposed. In opposition to this type of treaty the *koine eirene* was not a bilateral treaty and could be participated in by states that had not been involved in hostilities. This interpretation seems sound but deserves a fuller treatment; the suggestion that the real prototype of the *koine eirene* was the Amphictyonic League with its prohibition against destroying cities and cutting off their water supply deserves serious consideration.

Some points in the detailed discussion of the individual treaties call for comment. The treaty of 375/4 is claimed as a *koine eirene* providing for sanctions against violators; it was merely in connection with the application of sanctions that the hegemony of Sparta on land and Athens on sea was recognized. As an argument for this interpretation it is claimed that the clause in the treaty negotiated at Sparta in 371 making intervention voluntary (Xen. *Hell.* vi. 3. 18) becomes more intelligible if an earlier treaty had made intervention compulsory. It is also maintained that Aeschines ii. 32, which refers to a *symmachia* and quotes the decree (*τὸ κοινὸν δόγμα τῶν Ἑλλήνων*) recognizing the claims of Athens to Amphipolis, should be connected with this treaty rather than with the one negotiated at Sparta in 371.

For the congress held at Athens in 371 sometime after the Battle of Leuctra, the author comes to the conclusion that it resulted in a *koine eirene* ratified, among others, by Sparta. The argument is so ably and logically presented that, on first reading it, I felt convinced and was ready to abandon convictions of many years' standing. However, a further study of the evidence led to the conclusion that the treatment of the problem by Swoboda and Momigliano was more nearly correct,[1] and that the congress actually led to an expansion of the Second Athenian League. In the first place, the arrangements made at Athens differed from those of other treaties in that they included a pledge promising defense against attacks from outsiders and not merely action against signatories that violated the treaty. Now this clause, which would be unique in a *koine eirene*, corresponds to one of the chief points in the program of the Second Athenian League. In the second place, a comparison of the language of Xenophon's report with documents connected with the Second Athenian League makes it practically certain that the oath adopted at Athens in 371 contained a pledge to observe the constitution of the League.[2]

[1] Heinrich Swoboda, "Der hellenische Bund des Jahres 371 v. Ch.," *Rh. Mus.*, XLIX (1894), 321–52; Arnaldo Momigliano, "La *κοινὴ εἰρήνη* dal 386 al 338 a. C.," *Riv. di filol.*, LXII (1934), 482–514 at 487–90.

[2] The reference is to *ἐμμενῶ . . . . τοῖς ψηφίσμασι τοῖς Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων* (Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5. 2) which, with the substitution of a common synonym for *dogmata*, reproduces a pledge taken by new members when admitted into the League. It is impossible to give here a detailed discussion of the constitution of the Second Athenian League or to do more than indicate the basis for this conclusion. In another place (*Class. Phil.*, XXVIII [1933], 257–65) I have tried to show that when a *symmachy* was organized, the constitutional law was first adopted in decrees and later embodied in treaties. Thus the constitution of a league might well be referred to as *dogmata*. With this in mind, let us look at the frequently discussed pledge imposed on the Corcyraeans: *πό[λ]ε[μ]ον δὲ καὶ εἰρήνην μὴ ἐξεῖναι Κορκυραίοις ποιήσασθαι [ἄ]νευ Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τοῦ π]λήθους τῶν συμμάχων· ποιεῖν δὲ καὶ τἄλλα κατὰ τὰ δόγματα τῶν συμμάχων* (Ditt., *Syll.*[3], 151.11–15; cf. the similar pledges in the oaths both of the Corcyraeans and of the Athenians). Here two promises are made: (1) to be guided in all future actions on war and peace by the decisions of the Athenians and the *synedrion* of the League, and (2) to observe the *dogmata* already in force. That the *dogmata* refer to the constitutional law of the League is still clearer in *Syll.*[3], 150. 24, where the word is used in connection with the representation of the members in the *synedrion*. In the foregoing quotation, the decrees are referred to as decrees of the allies, but in the oath taken by the Corcyraeans the Athenians too are mentioned, as also in Xenophon's statement. Note, furthermore, that *καὶ τἄλλα* indicates that the rule that members could not make war or peace independently was included in the constitution and was repeated merely for emphasis. So in 371 the confirmation of the King's Peace and the clause promising defense of the members were repeated for the sake of emphasis.

The material just discussed is conclusive even if the participation of Sparta should be capable of proof. This, however, is unlikely in view of Xenophon's emphasis on the anti-Spartan character of the congress. As to Hampl's plausible argument for the participation of Sparta (p. 20, n. 1), it must suffice to say that the problem is even more complicated than his discussion indicates and that his conclusion should not be accepted without an examination of the arguments on the other side.

The discussion of the treaty of 362/1 is devoted mainly to an effort to prove that Diodorus (xv. 89. 1) is mistaken in connecting a *symmachia* with the treaty. For this Hampl relies largely on the absence of any word clearly referring to a *symmachy* in the extant fragments of the reply given by Greeks to an appeal from Persian satraps (Ditt., *Syll.*³, 182). In order to do this it is necessary to defend the usual dating of the inscription against the effort of Momigliano—in the article previously cited—to refer it to the Second Athenian League as expanded in 371/0. The latter argues in part that the document cannot be connected with a peace negotiated in the presence of representatives of the king and that the *koine eirene* of 362/1 was such a peace. The refutation of this argument by Hampl is vitiated by the fact that he has confused the roles of Artaxerxes and Tachos of Egypt in the account of Diodorus. This is unfortunate, for his conclusion, nonetheless, seems sound.[3] Thus, it is best to connect the document in question with the treaty of 362/1, but in opposition to Hampl it is well to give more weight to the fact that the content of the reply pictures the Greeks as ready to function as a *symmachy* and that so Diodorus probably is right.[4] After all, the inscription is so mutilated that the absence of the desired word is not decisive.

Next the treaty of 338/7 (the Hellenic League of Philip II) is discussed rather fully with the conclusion that it was a *koine eirene*. Considerable attention is devoted to the makeup of the *synedrion*, with special emphasis on the three votes of Zacynthus and Cephallenia which demonstrate that not every city was represented.[5] On this basis it is argued that the *synedrion* did not represent individual Hellenic states but the Hellenes as a whole (pp. 39 ff.) and so by the very nature of its composition in some mystical way was capable of making decisions on questions of Panhellenic interests. This explanation is at the same time too ingenious and too simple to be convincing. After a brief discussion of the Peace of Philocrates, which probably contained clauses somewhat resembling those of a *koine eirene*, an even briefer account is given of the treaty of 302 (Hellenic League), which so obviously refers to a *symmachy* that there is no escape. The discussion of individual treaties is brought to a close

[3] Diod. xv. 90. 2 reports that the Spartans were ready to co-operate with Tachos on account of the inclusion of Messene by the Persian king in the *koine eirene*. This certainly gives the impression that the king participated in the negotiations that preceded the recent treaty (that of 362/1), but the other accounts give the impression that the treaty was negotiated so soon after Mantineia that there was no time for Persian participation and that the Greeks themselves were responsible for the decision on Messene (Diod. xv. 89. 1–2; Pol. iv. 33. 8–9; Plut. *Ages.* 35). Now the proviso for the independence of the Messenians had been included in the abortive peace proposal secured from the king by Pelopidas a few years earlier (Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 36–37), and it is likely that when a peace later was made on these terms the Spartans remembered this and included the Persians in their wrath.

[4] See particularly Fritz Taeger, *Der Friede von 362/1* (Stuttgart, 1930), p. 3.

[5] The point is not entirely new (cf. *Class. Phil.*, XX [1925], 320 f.).

by a demonstration that there was no *koine eirene* concluded either in 366/5 or 346.

The study of the treaties mentioned above by Hampl and other scholars has brought out clearly that with the King's Peace—not itself called a *koine eirene*—and later treaties providing for a *koine eirene* something new was injected into Greek international relations. But it has shown also that the treaties at times provided for sanctions in such a way that they produced something closely related to a *symmachy*. The question then remains whether this feature caused the Greeks to think of the organizations as *symmachies* and to speak of them as such. In my opinion, the effort to prove that this was not the case has been a regular obsession in recent years. It has been overlooked that the frequent reference in literature to a *koine eirene*, particularly in connection with the Hellenic League of 338, need not prove that the organization was not a *symmachy* but merely that emphasis was placed on its most attractive feature. The arguments so far used are largely beside the point for the reason that one important piece of evidence has been overlooked completely. In a second-century arbitration there is a reference to an earlier arbitration between the Lacedaemonians and the Megalopolitans in the words *αἱ τ' ἐν τοῖ[ς] Ἕλλασιν καὶ συμμάχοις γεγενημέναι πρότερον [κ]ρ[ί]σεις* which has been recognized as referring to the days of Philip II.[6] Here *καὶ* must be used "to add a limiting or defining expression" (Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Lexicon*), so that the Hellenes that made the decision are defined as the *symmachoi* or the members of the Hellenic *symmachy* of the time. The passage thus proves definitely that the Hellenic League of Philip II was a *symmachy*. It also disposes of another theory—the theory that Philip, in addition to a *koine eirene*, organized a separate *symmachy*,[7] for in that case the act of arbitration would have devolved upon the league of peace and not on the *symmachy*.

This naturally brings up the question whether also some of the earlier organizations were *symmachies*. The discussion has been confined chiefly to the treaty of 362/1 in connection with which Diodorus mentions a *symmachy*. Even Hampl, though he uses the passage for another purpose, has not given due consideration to Aeschines ii. 32 where *συμμαχίας γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων συνελθούσης* is applied to an earlier congress, probably that of 375/4. This evidence is even more difficult to dispose of than that of Diodorus.[8] Thus it seems that some of the earlier organizations, though they may not have had assemblies meeting at regular intervals, were *symmachies*.

[6] Ditt., *Syll.*, 665. 19–20; cf. the commentary. The evidence of Polybius (ix. 33. 11–12; cf. also 28.7) is conclusive.

[7] Walther Schwahn, *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien* (Leipzig, 1930), pp. 55–57; Franz Schehl, "Zum korintischen Bund vom Jahre 338/37 v. Chr.," *Jahreshefte des öst. arch. Inst. in Wien*, XXVII (1932), 115–45; Momigliano, *op. cit.*, pp. 498–500.

[8] Those who believe that the congress of 371 at Athens resulted in a *koine eirene* will have to consider also Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5. 2.

In the section on the historical interpretation of the treaties Hampl contrasts sharply—and probably too sharply—the fifth century with its absence of power politics and the fourth century with its selfish imperialism directed by ambitious individuals. A corollary to this is the conclusion that the peace treaties discussed were instruments in the hands of ambitious Greek statesmen; even the King's Peace was not due to Persian statesmanship but was suggested by Sparta in her own interest. To this one might reply that the Persians may well have shown their statesmanship precisely in utilizing a proposal acceptable to a major Greek power. On the demonstration that the treaties actually made served as instruments in the hands of manipulators is based the conclusion that the peace movement exerted very little influence. As far as practical results are concerned, this is true; yet the influence of an ideal is often determined by the extent to which hypocrites do obeisance to it.

The section on the Second Athenian League with its introductory remarks about earlier *symmachies* contains much that is good. The Peloponnesian League is excellently treated, though I disagree with the statement (p. 122) that Sparta cast one vote in the assembly the same as any other member. Our best guide to the procedure is the events of 432, when, as Hampl himself points out, Sparta made her own decision before the question was submitted to the allies. At the meeting used by him to support his theory (Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 11 ff.) it is clear that the allies at least knew how the Spartans felt on the subject submitted. Sparta probably cast no vote at all in the assembly of the League but exercised her control through the practice of calling meetings only when she was ready to act. Also, in the case of the appeal from Acanthus referred to by Hampl, the Spartan officials must have known what it was all about before a meeting of the allies was called. There is a similar mistake, at least in my opinion, in the interpretation of the Second Athenian League. The treaty with Corcyra discussed previously and again used in the present connection by Hampl (p. 129) hardly proves his point. In fact, in the clause concerning future actions on war and peace the Athenians and the allies stand side by side as partners with equal shares in determining the policy to be adopted. On the other hand, in the Delian League Athens was represented in the assembly on terms of equality with other states. It is one of the merits of Hampl (p. 125) to assemble evidence for this, instead of merely taking it for granted.

J. A. O. Larsen

University of Chicago

Varro on the Latin Language: With an English Translation, Vol. I: *Books v–vii.* By Roland G. Kent. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1938. Pp. l+367. $2.50 (leather, $3.50).

In his salad days a certain man was green enough to join one (but only one) "learned" society for life, and of that one he is, therefore, being still alive, a

member. He has no intention of releasing it from its bond; if it admits unsuspecting youngsters, full of zeal for the classics, into its life-membership before they can know much about the ways of this world, it ought to be held to its bond to the bitter end. So he still receives the *Proceedings* of the Classical Association of England and Wales, and, as a good Lancashire man and individualist, he hopes to get his money's worth by reading them, even if the children scribble over the presidential address afterward. In the latest number (Vol. XXXV [1938]) Mr. T. R. Glover, of the University of Cambridge, is pleased to attack what he calls philology—for in England they still say "philology" when they mean "comparative philology." What the president seems to have forgotten is that comparativists are also, and in the proper sense of the term, philologists, and drive a double team—witness Kent's edition of the *De lingua Latina;* he is altogether wrong when he asserts that "philology" is a science "only very remotely related to the study of literature." The "literary man's" assault, so popular in our day, on learning and exact scholarship is in fact more dangerous than anything else could be for the "study of literature." When a poet or poetaster writes that scholars are "all eyes for an error in the text" but have no eye "for this world or the next" (how does he know what scholars think of this generation and its future?), and is applauded for writing it, it is not difficult to understand why we have moved far enough from the days of Porson to see second-rate men of letters scoffing at second-rate scholars, and "co-operative scholarship" (a contradiction in terms if it means anything at all) masquerading as literature. True scholarship and genuine literature have much to gain and nothing to fear from one another.

No one pretends that Varro's *De lingua Latina* is great literature. There are many volumes, however, in the Loeb series, my first volume of which I now at last possess, which are not great literature either, but are useful to students of literature. Varro himself was a poet, philosopher, and a man of letters, as well as a philologist, a man after Glover's own heart, "contemplating all time and all existence" and eager that others should do the same. It is a misfortune that his works on literature have been lost. As it is, the abundant quotations from old Latin poets in the *De lingua Latina* have their uses. Kent has not scrupled to make his author write sense; at v. 24 he ends the quotation from Lucilius 1308 Marx with *humoremque* for the manuscript *imbremque,* since, as he quite properly argues, without *humor* or a derivative of it the citation is pointless. One wonders why this had not been seen before. Again at v. 50 it is no credit to earlier editors that the accusative *uiam dexteriorem* in the third quotation from the *Sacra Argeorum* was not changed long ago to match the prosecutive ablative *sinistra uia* (Scaliger, who seems to have taken the words as nominative) of the first. Kent's text may, in general, be said to have a domestic flavor. In this first volume there are seventy-nine readings ascribed to Kent (fifty-eight) and Fay (twenty-one) together, against sev-

enty-eight ascribed to Goetz and Schoell. Not all of them are right. Presumably Varro's *De lingua Latina* has been admitted into the Loeb canon in the belief that the work is valuable, for its own sake, to others in addition to those scholars who can make competent use for themselves of the Latin text, with all its difficulties and obscurities. And it is something to have this translation and the appended notes to keep etymological Rip van Winkles when occasionally they consult the *De lingua Latina*, usually by means of the monosyllabic warning "wrong," from revealing in public the duration and depth of their slumbers.

But, as the translator himself tells us, many departures from the manuscript authority have been made by him because they were demanded as the basis of a text that could be translated. Housman used to quote with approval Haupt's declaration: "If the sense requires it, I am prepared to write *Constantinopolitanus* where the MSS. have the monosyllabic interjection *O*." Granted that the principle, which Kent seems to have adopted as his own, is sound, yet it produces, in a case like his, and in his own words about the inaccessible Canal, a text that is "so highly emended that, while it is translatable, it cannot be accepted *in toto*" (see *TAPA*, LXVII [1936], 66). At the same time generous acknowledgment must be made of his courageous struggle to resolve many desperate cruces which, even if the reader who thinks for himself will not always think it successful, at least makes the text more readable than that of the timid Goetz and Schoell.

This translation is the first into English. There is still no translation into German, and only two others into modern languages: "that of Huot into French, a mere paraphrase which often omits whole sentences, and that of Canal into Italian" (Kent, p. xlvi). Kent's translation is straightforward, and, granted his text, and not infrequently granted also etymological conjecture, accurate. But at times these are not to be granted. At vi. 2, for example, *turdelix* is translated "spiral entrance for thrushes." This rests on Fay's fantastic explanation of *turdelix* as *turdus* plus ἕλιξ (and on an appeal to Varro, *De R. R.* iii. 5. 3, *coclia*). The dictionaries fail to define *turdelix*, and Goetz and Schoell (*De L. L.*, p. 260) complain: "*turdelix, turdelicis* uocis nusquam nec uola nec uestigium." Ah me! But all four of them should have looked a little farther: mod. Sic. *turduliku*, Calabr. *turduliče*, said to mean "magpie" —*turdela* is attested (Festus [Lindsay (1930), p. 277] and Isid. *Et.* xii. 7. 71), cf. the form of *mustela*, and to it apparently is added a guttural extension common in the names of birds (*cornix, coturnix, spinturnix,* πέρδιξ) and other creatures (*murex, pulex, sorex*).

The translation of the beginning of v. 98 reads smoothly enough, until one observes that in the Latin

aries, ut quidam dicebant, ab aris; ueteres nostri ariuga, hinc ariugus

Kent has introduced four changes of his own. He has added *ut* and *ab* and changed the manuscript *ares* (a form which students of Vulgar Latin have

not despised) to *aris* and *ariugas* to *ariugus; quidam* he takes from Goetz-Schoell (for the manuscript *qui eam*). The reader is presented in the translation with *ariuga*, "altar-mate," without any hint that neither form nor meaning is even reasonably sure (*ariuges* of the glossaries suggests a nom. *ariux; hariuga, hariga,* other forms cited by Kent himself are just as doubtful). And Kent adds a long note to explain not only *ariuga* but also *ariugus* as if neither were doubtful in the slightest degree. Two things are clear: first, many places in Varro are so indescribably corrupt and obscure that only Varro or the Almighty could now tell us what Varro wrote and what it meant—it takes something more than courage to publish a translation of the *De lingua Latina* (which is why it has not been done into English or German before); and, second, for the same reason, the work lends itself to just the sort of thing that has been done in the place I have quoted. But the result is a quicksand, incapable of bearing any weight, and to be trodden by no man save at his peril. Even where the text was probably sound, or not demonstrably corrupt, e.g., v. 40, *diuidi . . . . scribit Sulpicius plebei rura largiter ad aream* ("Verba *plebei . . . . aream* sana esse uidentur," Goetz-Schoell) changes have sometimes been introduced, here *ad adoream* (after Fay), and the changed text is of course what is translated into English. What is the user innocent of Latin to do? At vi. 72 *itaqu⟨e⟩ is qui dicit in tragoedia,* read hitherto, becomes *itaqu⟨e⟩ is qu⟨o⟩i dicit⟨ur⟩ in comoedia,* which is either tragic or comic, as you choose, Juv. *Sat.* x. 28–30. At vii. 23 assonance in the saturnian defends *sedantes* (Goetz-Schoell) against change and the meaning can be defended too.

The translation contains a few words that are not in my English dictionary: *hostic* (p. 33), and these three as names of comestibles, *softies* (p. 103), *stuffy* (p. 107), *stufflet* (*ibid.*). On page 223 *pueris* is not "boys" but "children," and on page 337 the translation "Goldilocks" for *rutilae* is, as the translator truthfully remarks, "a politer term"!

In etymological matters Kent is repeatedly a safe guide. To the uninitiate that will be a great help; they will now be able to separate the sheep from the goats in Varro's herd of strange derivations. The expert will find little that is not to be found already in authoritative works, but Kent's new suggestions and explanations (e.g., on *conuallis*, p. 19; cf. Safarewicz in *Munera philol. L. Ćwilinški oblata* [Posen, 1936], pp. 304–11, on *com-* compounded with words beginning with *u-*) are all, or almost all, sane and reasonable, though many of his notes will strike any etymologist who is not a mere tyro, and after all etymologists are the ones most likely to consult the *De lingua Latina*, as elementary or jejune. For example (v. 37): "Varro takes *semen* as from *semis* 'half', because the *semen* is less in quantity than that which grows from it; an incorrect etymology." The commonly accepted etymology of *saeculum*, which Kent also accepts (vi. 11, "ultimately from the root 'to sow' seen in *semen* 'seed' ") has recently been attacked more than once (see *Glotta*,

XXVII [1938], 91). The reference there is to an article by von Blumenthal, who elsewhere (*IF*, LIII [1935], 120) would write at v. 68

sol ⟨*uel a s*⟩*auel, quod ita Sabini, uel* . . . .

which at least deserved consideration.

Protest must be made against the use of nothing later than K. O. Mueller's edition of Festus; Lindsay's in *Glossaria Latina*, Vol. IV (1930), is indispensable to anyone who works with the *De lingua Latina*, and life is too short to be employed for ever in turning the numbers of Mueller's pages of 1839 into Lindsay's of 1913 and those into Lindsay's of 1930. Citation of the Teubner Lindsay would have sufficed to save all that. In like manner the new collection of Greek comic fragments of Sicily and Magna Graecia made by Olivieri (1930) supplements Kaibel's (1899) to which Kent refers, and Bailey's collection of the remains of Epicurus (1926) has some improvements over Usener's (1887), used by Kent. Nonius Marcellus is usually cited by the numbers of Mercier's pages (1589), but most of us use Lindsay's edition (1903), not the reprint (1825) of the second edition (1614) of Mercier. The reference numbers to the editions of Varro by Huot and Canal, respectively, are 21 and 22, not 20 and 21 (p. xlvi).

In a careful reading of the volume I have noted a number of places where more might have been said (e.g., v. 22, cf. 35, Varro's rustic spelling *ueha* at *De R. R.* i. 2.14 probably accounts for his odd notion that *uia* is to be connected with *uehere*) or where a briefly stated opinion of some etymological point is open to discussion (v. 23, *Palatium, Balatium* probably Illyrian, and *P-* Etruscanized, cf. Messapic *baletθihi, Baletium* in Calabria); and a smaller number in regard to which I find myself in disagreement with Kent. These last, however, are matters of opinion and do not affect my judgment that his volume (may we hope for indexes in Vol. II ?) is a careful piece of work on which much thought and labor have been spent, a worthy member of the series to which it belongs, *cum* (in Varro's words, v. 9, which may be commended to the attention of Mr. Glover) *poeticis multis uerbis magis delecter quam utar, antiquis magis utar quam delecter*. As for me, I take delight equally in both.

J. WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions. By R. P. AUSTIN. London: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xii+130+14 plates. $3.50.

This book makes a new and welcome advance in the methodology of epigraphical study. Austin shows how a proper understanding of the stoichedon order is essential not only to a study of the stonecutter's technique but also to the restoration, and possible identification, of ancient texts. Anyone who attempts to edit a stoichedon text may read what he has to say with profit,

and some of his practical suggestions must, sooner or later, be generally adopted.

After a brief introduction on the reasons for the use of stoichedon order, the author cites (chap. ii) early examples and discusses (chap. iii) individual letter-forms and their influence on the style. The examples given to support his argument are well chosen and show close and sympathetic study of the original monuments. I note particularly the careful description of the "Salaminian Decree" (*IG*, I^2, 1) on pages 20–21, in which Austin shows on technical grounds that the present restoration cannot be literally exact (see also p. 45). Similar demonstrations may be made elsewhere, as, for example, in *IG*, I^2, 28, where the exigencies of stoichedon style have not been sufficiently respected (p. 42).

The development of the order is closely associated with the abandonment of boustrophedon writing, beginning at least as early as the second half of the sixth century, but its most rigid application came with the use of a checker pattern (*ca.* 500 B.C.) for laying out the letters of an inscription on stone. Austin describes these checkers in detail (pp. 26 ff.), and shows their importance for epigraphists who wish to add new fragments to already published inscriptions. His recommendation that all stoichedon texts should henceforth be published with checker measurements commands unreserved approval. Austin himself gives a table (pp. 33–36) for 130 inscriptions already published in the Attic *Corpus*. Whether or not the information is always to be presented in precisely the form which he uses, it is only a matter of time before all stoichedon inscriptions must be documented in this way.

It may be well to register here the warning that complete accuracy in determining the measurements of each checker pattern cannot be expected from squeezes. Most paper used for squeezes shrinks, some of it to a surprising degree, and frequently with different coefficients of shrinkage along and across the grain. For a practical trial-and-error method of identifying fragments the squeeze measurements may do very well, but for publication the spacings should be taken from the stone itself.

Austin devotes a considerable part of his volume to a descriptive catalogue of significant monuments (*a*) in Attica and (*b*) outside Attica. The division into these two categories reflects again the importance of Athens for the development and history of the style. Applying his new knowledge, he is able to throw light on many old problems. I note especially the shrewd conjecture that *IG*, I^2, 355*a*, was rejected because the script did not meet the specified stoichedon standard (pp. 62–63). This may well be right, but one wonders whether the stonecutter may not have got himself into trouble by leaving no separate column for figures, in particular for the first large item of one hundred talents which had to be posted as receipts for the year. Then there is the question of syllabic division, which might always cause trouble in stoichedon texts. Austin shows that the Attic decrees of the fifth and fourth centuries adhered

pretty strictly to a true stoichedon order (p. 46). It is not necessary to assume, as he does, that *IG*, I², 109, is an exception, for the readings in the *Corpus* do not give the best text (see Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, I, 168 and 213–14). Austin distinguishes, quite properly, between syllabic division, according to the Hellenistic rules, and the "natural" divisions that appear in many of the early documents. I think we should assume that in the fifth century the natural divisions were to all intents and purposes syllabic, and (for example) no longer count as true exceptions the readings [Δ]ο[ρ]ύφιλ|ος in *SEG*, V, 13 (p. 56) and Παιαν|[ιεύς] in *SEG*, V, 34 (p. 57).

The breakdown of the style came in the third century. In his concluding chapters Austin traces the later history, giving examples of revivals even in Roman times, but by the last quarter of the third century true stoichedon inscriptions had become exceedingly rare. He rightly lays emphasis on the influence of the tapering stele (p. 112) for the abandonment of the style and on the increasing desire of the stonecutters for syllabification (p. 111), but stresses too much (in my opinion) the rapidity of the decline (see Dow, *Hesperia*, Supplement I, p. 30) and the motive of economy (pp. 104–5). I note that he follows Dinsmoor's *Archons of Athens* for dates of the Athenian eponymous magistrates in Hellenistic times. Many of Dinsmoor's dates are valid, but it is fairly certain that Symmachos was archon in 188/187 rather than 189/188 (p. 113). See Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, page 28; these early second-century dates are confirmed in *Hesperia*, III (1934), 20 and V (1936), 429–30.

The reader finishes the book with a feeling of great satisfaction that so much has been accomplished. Austin has demonstrated that this sympathetic study of the monuments themselves, quite apart from what they say, can be of enormous service even for the better understanding of the texts, and we are grateful to him for his contribution. One hopes that soon he will give us further results of his continued study in Greek inscriptions.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

Institute for Advanced Study

Papers of the British School at Rome, Vol. XIII. London: Macmillan & Co., 1935. Pp. 87.

The first article, by J. A. Richmond, bears the title "Trajan's Army on Trajan's Column" (pp. 1–40). The author discusses sixteen scenes from the column reliefs, illustrating them with reproductions from the edition by Cichorius, in order to test the "realism" of the reliefs in antiquarian details, uniforms, armor, and, mainly, fortifications. This analysis is preceded by an introduction dealing with the general problem of the "accuracy" of the reliefs. Richmond accepts some basic results of my stylistic analysis. He agrees

that neither historically nor topographically do the reliefs give exact reports of a documentary character but that they are a general and stylized representation of the Roman army in action. On the other hand, he takes it for granted that the detailed rendering of antiquarian and architectural features is the expression of a "realistic" as opposed to an "impressionistic" spirit. The terminology is certainly misleading: detailed rendering is not necessarily "realistic," as the example of Flemish painting could illustrate. It may aim to give the illusion of a rich world, without observing complete realism in details. The author tries to explain the combination of the obviously non-documentary character of the whole work with the alleged "realism" of details by the bold hypothesis that (in a very modern fashion) there existed drawings made by artist-war-reporters, which later were translated into stone. To test this theory, he proceeds in his analysis, which, for the single scenes chosen, is divided into a description containing the interpretation and a commentary discussing the related literary sources and archeological documents for the details. These commentaries are extremely valuable and reveal an admirable command of facts. Everybody studying Roman military antiquities will consult this work in the future. It is needless to point out further that the interpretation of the column reliefs on such a solid basis throws much new light on hitherto unexplained details. But, as to the author's thesis, they show only that the details are, to a large extent, rooted in really existing features. The source of knowledge of such details can as well have been a general familiarity with standardized features of the Roman army and its architecture derived from an artistic tradition handed down in historical art, especially in the triumphal paintings. Individual characters of barbarian types, for instance, could have impressed themselves on the artist in the Dacian triumph. But I see no evidence for the theory of artist-war-reporters in the results of this study. On the contrary, the very fact that the author is able to illustrate the "realism" of details with examples taken mainly from Great Britain, and especially the use of Gaulish features of domestic architecture and fortification (pp. 38 ff.) for the characterization of the Dacians as barbarians, contradicts his theory of sketches made during the campaigns. On the other hand, Richmond is compelled to explain the many and often recurrent obvious unrealities as misinterpretations of the original sketches by the sculptors, although these sketches necessarily would have been very detailed. It is not possible to deal in this review with the details which could further substantiate my criticism. However, I wish to express my profound admiration for the excellent work of comparison. If the author would proceed to write an extensive commentary on the antiquarian details of the column, this certainly would become a basic work for this field—and it might lead Mr. Richmond himself to clarify and correct his theory.

Richmond, together with W. G. Holford, publishes another study on the town plan of Roman Verona (pp. 69–76). The documentary evidence for its

development is the tradition about a colony of 69 B.C. and an inscription of the city wall of A.D. 265. The authors, however, try to show that the regular town plan, which still survives, was laid out in the early Augustan period and corresponded in size and shape almost exactly to that of Turin. This theory entails the hypothesis that the Adige has changed its course very much on both the east and the west sides of the town and destroyed considerable parts at the respective corners. Since there exist no remains necessitating such a reconstruction, the theory seems highly improbable to me (see also Marconi, *Verona Romana* [Bergamo, 1937]). One could, with more probability, assume that the plan of the original republican colony is preserved in a rectangle of smaller size. The regular quarters outside this rectangle could have been added gradually (cf. *RE*, "Staedtebau," col. 2087) and could already have covered in the Augustan age the area which then was limited on the southeast side by the Porta dei Leoni and, on the southwest, by the Porta dei Borsari. Parts of these gates, as the authors believe, or their whole structure, as Kaehler recently tried to prove (*Arch. Jahrb.*, 1935, pp. 138 ff.), could then be well dated back to the early Empire. The discussion and illustration (Fig. 3) of the technique of the wall of Gallienus is valuable.

F. H. Wilson's "Studies in the History and Economic History of Ostia, Part I" (pp. 41–68) gives an account of the general evolution of the town from its beginnings to the second century of our era. This account is based on archeological evidence, including some observations made by the author at the site, and upon epigraphic documents. The survey is divided into three sections dealing with the periods from the fourth to the second centuries B.C., the first centuries B.C. and A.D., and the second century A.D., respectively —an arrangement which, as to the second section, is hardly to be called logical. Useful as it is, the summary of the casual archeological evidence, from which often far-reaching conclusions have been drawn, is not sufficiently grounded. For instance, the conclusion *ex silentio* that in the earlier part of the first century of our era buildings of "permanent" character were still scanty (pp. 47 ff.) is hardly convincing. Stress is laid by the author on the character and composition of the office-holding class, and he opposes, probably too sharply, an earlier period with a landed Roman aristocracy to the later plutocracy of freedmen, separating these two aspects by a sharp break about A.D. 100. In the third part he rightly emphasizes the increase of the importance of the *collegia*. Probably Mr. Wilson was not yet able to use the valuable study of P. Harsh (*Mem. Amer. Acad.*, Vol. XII [1935]) on the domestic architecture in Ostia. But throughout the whole article one misses a use of the modern literature dealing with the subject from general points of view. That this leads to dangerous conclusions is obvious and can be illustrated by the author's suggestion that the occurrence of high brick buildings in Ostia is due to a local economic development. A glance at Boëthius' studies would have set him right on this point. Likewise, a use of such general

works as Dubois's "Pouzzoles antiques" and Westermann's admirable article "Sklaverei" in *RE* would not only have enabled him to look at Ostia in connection with general evolutions, but it would also have added facts, opened points of view, and saved him repetitions.

In another contribution (pp. 77–87) Mr. Wilson discusses the so-called *Magazzini republicani* in Ostia. The useful study is illustrated with a plan and two reconstructed plans of single periods. He distinguishes, on the basis of technical observations, five periods (some of which, however, include features of various dates) dating from the late republican age to the late third century of our era. The reconstruction and interpretation remain somewhat doubtful especially on account of the fragmentary state of preservation of the first building and the incompleteness of excavation. But Mr. Wilson is certainly right in stating that there exists no evidence for the use of the republican structure as *horrea*. On the other hand, I see in the facts he states no convincing argument for his assumption that the central part of this building was converted into a bath as early as the end of the first century of our era. Only the plan and details of his fifth period (late third century) indicate this use.

KARL LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN

New York University

The Clothing of the Ancient Romans. By LILLIAN M. WILSON. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. xiii+178+95 plates. $5.00.

Through her excellent book, *The Roman Toga*,[1] Miss Wilson is already well known to all students of Roman costume, and the present work shows the same care in the collection of material and the same discriminating study of available evidence. Her sources are Latin literature and Roman painting and sculpture, of which the sculpture has proved to be by far the most productive. She has studied the monuments at firsthand in the museums.

Included in her discussion are raw materials, colors, spinning, weaving, and sewing. Then come men's garments: the toga (the chapter on which is a summary of her former book), the tunic, and in four successive chapters the different kinds of cloaks: *pallium*, *abolla*, *paenula*, *paludamentum*, *sagum*, *laena*, *lacerna*, and *birrus*. Other chapters deal with the dress of women and children.

The subject is a difficult one, and in the case of many of the garments the references in literature are so slight and indefinite, and the difficulty of identifying details on monuments is so great, that even after Miss Wilson's careful investigation and ingenious explanations many problems remain and probably will always remain. This uncertainty is inherent in the subject. That the measure of uncertainty is now as limited as it is we owe chiefly to Miss Wilson's researches.

[1] Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1924.

A useful part of the book is the account of the various shades of the shellfish purple, with the more detailed discussion of the inexpensive dyes which were used as substitutes for the *murex* (pp. 8 ff.). The subject is admirably illustrated by the frontispiece, which shows in color seven shades of purple, produced from recipes in the *Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis*.[2] In this reproduction of the dyes the author has had the co-operation of trained chemists, and the results are good. Among other things in her description of the dyeing process Miss Wilson makes it clear that it was not the cloth that was dyed. Wool was dyed in the fleece; linen, cotton, and silk in the thread.

There is a plausible explanation of the *tunica recta* on pages 57 ff. The author concludes her discussion as follows:

> Summing up the evidence we find that the original Roman tunic which for centuries was used for ordinary occasions was woven in two pieces, having a seam on each shoulder; that at some early date, and perhaps by Tanaquil, another style of tunic, called the *tunica recta*, and probably woven in one straight piece, was introduced, which for several centuries was used as the garment of the *tirones* and of the brides; the ancient loom being retained for weaving it, though a more convenient loom was adopted for other weaving.

In regard to the stripes on tunics Miss Wilson decides (pp. 61 ff.) that they were of three different widths, adding a very narrow stripe for boys' tunics to the *angustus clavus* of the equestrian and the *latus clavus* of the senatorial tunic. As an example of the stripe on the tunic of boys she mentions the bronze statue of a *camillus* in the Capitoline Museum at Rome and the paintings of boys in the wineshop on the Strada di Mercurio in Pompeii. The stripe is about three-eighths of an inch in width; it passes over each shoulder and extends to the bottom of the tunic on both back and front. It was narrower than the *angustus clavus* of the knights, which was about one and one-eighth inches in width. The *latus clavus* was much wider. Miss Wilson rightly dismisses the conjecture that the *latus clavus* was a panel down the front of the tunic (p. 64). Like the *angustus clavus*, it ran over each shoulder in front and behind.

On page 74 the author adduces the evidence for the wearing of close-fitting knee breeches not only by Roman soldiers in Dacia and other cold countries but also by citizens of rank when hunting or riding in Italy. The name of the garment was *feminalia* and it was worn under the toga. Nor is the use of it confined to later times. Augustus himself wore *feminalia*.

The different kinds of cloaks are described at length, and in the case of almost all of them directions for their reconstruction are given and suggestions made in regard to the best material to be used. In Miss Wilson's opinion, "The *abolla* and the *pallium*, if not identical, were closely related" (p. 86). But the discussion leaves the problem of the *abolla* still unsolved. The term is sometimes applied to the cloak of a philosopher, presumably plain or coarse, but elsewhere used of the robe of a prince, the beauty of which aroused the envy of the Emperor Caligula.

[2] Edited by O. Lagercrantz, Uppsala, 1913.

The descriptions of *paenula, lacerna*, and *cucullus* are all convincing. The hood of a *paenula* was called *capitium; cucullus* was the name of a garment: a hood with a small cape covering the shoulders. It was well adapted for bad weather and could be used with a *lacerna*. That this garment or one of the same general style, like the *bardocucullus*, would look like a *paenula* when put on a monkey as in the show referred to by Martial in *Ep.* xiv. 128 is plausible enough.

In her treatment of the *sagum* on page 108 Miss Wilson makes an interesting comment. After referring to the fact that Marcus Aurelius when he returned to Italy in A.D. 176 after serious efforts to promote the cause of peace in the East, on landing in Brindisi put on his toga and ordered his soldiers to do likewise, she points out that there is not a single soldier in the elaborate reliefs in the column of Marcus Aurelius who is represented as wearing a *sagum*, the common military cloak.[3]

The author doubts the view held by some scholars that girls before marriage, just like boys before the assumption of the *toga virilis*, wore the *toga praetexta*. She thinks that this could have been customary only in a "relatively early period." But she has not demonstrated the invalidity of the old theory. Her explanation of the young girl who appears in a toga on one of the reliefs of the Ara Pacis—namely, that this was merely a retention of an old custom on a ceremonial occasion—is not probable, and the same may be said of her analysis of the passage in Propertius (v. 11. 13).

There are not many errors in the book. To be sure the reference to Commodus in a statement about first-century luxury is somewhat puzzling (p. 4). It looks as if part of the sentence had dropped out. Horace *Epist.* i. 34 is given for Horace *Epod.* i. 34 in footnote 12 on page 59. *Right* arm should be substituted for *left* arm at the beginning of the fourth line of the second paragraph on page 84. The reference in footnote 37 on page 106 should be Martial i. 3. 8. The explanation given by Festus of the bride's veil—namely, that "the bride is wrapped in it on account of the good omen, because it is always worn by the wife of a flamen, to whom it is not allowed to get a divorce"—is adopted on page 142, but Festus is surely wrong. The significance of the veil is different in the two cases. With the bride it emphasizes the virtue of modesty; with the *flaminica* its use is connected with the separation of the sacred from the profane, the officiating priest or priestess from the crowd attending a sacrifice.

Only a few misprints occur: performation for perforation (p. 20), fullonia for *fullonia* (p. 27), and Zolius for Zoilus (p. 170).

G. J. LAING

University of Chicago

[3] See the author's more detailed treatment of this subject in "Sculptural Evidence of an Army Order Issued by Marcus Aurelius," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, VII (1929), 173 ff.

The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters: Preliminary Report of the Sixth Season of Work, October, 1932—March, 1933. Edited by M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, C. Hopkins, and C. B. Welles. New Haven, 1936.

With every succeeding report, the importance of the excavations at Dura-Europus continues to increase. As a source for the study of the later history of the Near East and particularly of the fusion of Iranian and Hellenistic elements in the culture of that area these volumes are indispensable. The isolation of the site, the dry climate, and, still more important, the construction of a great mud-brick ramp to brace the weakening city wall preserved objects of daily life and delicate frescoes in a manner seldom seen outside Egypt and certainly never before encountered in the region of the Two Rivers. Parchment, papyri, cloth, leather still flexible, wood so fresh in appearance that ancient doors may be mistaken for modern packing-case sides—all these and more remained for the excavators.

The contents of the sixth report are perhaps more important than any of those which preceded it. As before, certain classes of objects such as pottery and smaller objects of daily use are reserved for the final publication. The architecture is treated fully, and the finds made in the course of clearance work are described with it. The Roman baths, the House of the Scribes, and the synagogue are of especial interest. One chapter is devoted to the mines and siege works, while other sections take up the very unusual objects found therein. The horse armor, the Roman *scutum*, and other weapons are dealt with in a special section. Among the written documents a fragment of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, copied fifty to eighty years after the composition of the original, will be of interest to all classicists. A number of legal documents help to clear up points which remain uncertain in earlier published material. Statistical information and preliminary publication of the season's numismatic material provokes interesting speculation along historical and economic lines. A brief chapter is devoted to additions and revisions of earlier reports. The volume concludes with a summary of the new evidence secured during the season for the history of Dura.

Of the material noted above, that which deals with the Jewish synagogue is probably the most important. Fortunately for the archeologist, the synagogue was built at a time when the best locations within the walls had already been occupied, and this, coupled with the fact that earlier anti-Semitic feeling had left its mark of unpopularity, forced the builders to utilize a less desirable site near the city wall. The structure was therefore preserved under the sloping wall of mud brick erected upon the approach of the Sasanians to reinforce the city wall.

The synagogue was rebuilt about a decade before the downfall of the city, and it is this second construction which furnished the remarkable paintings discovered by the expedition. The walls of the building were divided into

registers which in turn were laid out in panels of a size suitable for the subject at hand. On these panels were painted scenes from the Old Testament—the Exodus and the wandering in the wilderness, Solomon's temple, the ark in the land of the Philistines, Esther and Mordecai, and many other subjects. While the identification of some of the more fragmentary panels is not yet accomplished with certainty, most of the subject matter is clear. These paintings are the final proof that early Judaism made use of pictorial representations. In addition they furnish us with another fine group of paintings of the Irano-Hellenistic school which flourished at Dura. Further study of them should serve to illuminate obscure passages of Jewish tradition as well as possible connections between Jewish and Christian art of the first centuries of our era.

In another structure along the city wall, a series of murals portraying banqueting and hunting scenes were uncovered. The figures reclining on benches suggest the usual funerary banquet of the Near East, but in this case they may represent scenes from actual life, an idea which fits in with the appearance on the same wall of a hunting scene. The constant use of the flying gallop in the latter brings up the question of the origin and spread of this peculiar method of representing a speeding animal.

Dura has added greatly to our knowledge of military affairs in the ancient world. This report contains descriptions and plans of the saps driven under the walls and towers of Dura by the besieging Sasanians and of the countermines of the inhabitants of the town. While the mines were intended to cause the walls to fall outward and thus open the defenses to the attackers, a great ramp of baked brick and debris was pressed toward the wall so that machines might be pushed up it to overtop the city wall. At the same time a gallery wide enough for four men to move abreast in it was driven under the city wall to come out just behind the point where the ramp reached the defenses. These mines and the countermines which the inhabitants dug are the first actual operations of this type which have ever been found. In some of the tunnels the timber remains as sound as the day it was first installed.

The bodies of those killed in the fighting in these mines were found where they fell, still wearing their armor and with their weapons scattered about them. In the debris of a tower, two housings of scale armor for horses were recovered in an almost perfect state of preservation. Arrows and points of a number of types both for bow and for machines have been found. The only known example of a Roman *scutum*, with its plywood, leather, and painted linen still preserved, is but another of the Dura finds which have continued year after year to make this site one of the most important in the Near East. The excavation work has now ceased for the time being; yet another preliminary report is to appear. The final reports, with fuller discussion of the important finds as well as complete publication of the lesser objects of daily life, are eagerly awaited.

Neilson C. Debevoise

A Numismatic Commentary on the "Res gestae" of Augustus. By JESSIE D. NEWBY. Iowa City: Athens Press, 1938. Pp. xvi+117 with 4 plates. $3.50.

The publication in 1927 of a fragment of the *Res gestae Divi Augusti* found at Pisidian Antioch has given notable impulse to the study of Augustus' political testament. The purpose of the work under review, which has been so little influenced by the discovery at Antioch as to be based on Diehl's edition of 1925, is to gather the testimony of coins (including medallions and tesserae) which refer by type, legend, or any other way to the claims made by Augustus in the *Res gestae* (p. xv). In this purpose the author has succeeded admirably. Her study not only brings together the numismatic evidence cited by Mommsen, Gardthausen, Fitzler-Seeck, and Platner-Ashby but adds considerable new material—including some of dubious authenticity and of uncertain attribution. The result is a useful guide to the relationship between the *Res gestae* and the coinage of Augustus.

As a work of reference it suffers, however, from grave defects. It is not and was not intended to be (p. 79) a corpus of numismatic allusion to the claims of the *Res gestae*. The author's method is to reproduce the *Res gestae* sentence by sentence with historical comment and then to cite a description of *one* coin that refers to the passage in question. Regularly (Nos. 4 [cf. also p. 35], 8, 11, 72, 96, 104, 117, 137, and p. 86), when a statement made by Augustus is confirmed by many coins, the author is content merely to mention the fact without referring the reader to them. Another serious defect is the failure to give cross-references to Cohen and Mattingly-Sydenham's *Roman Imperial Coinage*, which needlessly complicates the equation of Miss Newby's coins with those cited by other students of the *Res gestae*. The deliberate treatment (pp. xv and 84, No. 136) of unauthentic coins and those of dubious attribution (Nos. 20, 73, 75, 109, 112, 126, 134, 136, 146; and cf. p. 101) on an equal footing with authentic ones seems ill advised. Footnotes of warning are sometimes overlooked. The only coins cited by others whose omission I have noted are those which Mommsen cites in RG^2 30 and 119 (*nummi Accitani*). The practice of quoting verbatim the descriptions of others for the coins cited might well have been relaxed in citing No. 148, since Boutkowski's "COL NIM (*sic!*)" is shown by Miss Newby's own plate (3.148) to be incorrect or, at most, a variant. Finally, there is a tendency to neglect later editions and books[1] as well as authoritative works of reference.[2]

A few of the more indirect references which Miss Newby has found will undoubtedly seem too indirect to some. Several, however, are clearly wrong. No. 9, on the reverse of which Augustus is shown in a typical pose of address, is hardly a reference to the statement that five hundred thousand Roman

[1] Cf. pp. 8 (n. 2), 47 (n. 6), 52 (n. 12), 59 (n. 16), 63 (nn. 6 and 9), and 64 (n. 11; but cf. n. 12).

[2] Cf. below the discussion of nn. 90 and 94.

citizens swore allegiance to him (cf. p. 72). Nor is the military dress of Augustus that of a "legionary soldier" (p. 7). No. 90, which is cited as a reference to Augustus' restoration of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, is dated in 42 B.C. But the restoration of the temple is to be dated about 31 B.C. (Platner-Ashby, p. 293). No. 94 is cited as a reference to Augustus' restoration of eighty-two temples. The change in the date of the festival of Honos and Virtus by Augustus, on which the attribution of the coin is based, is associated, however, by Fitzler-Seeck (*RE*, X, 356) with the celebration of the *ludi saeculares*. There is, moreover, no evidence that Augustus restored either of the temples of Honos and Virtus at Rome (cf. Platner-Ashby, pp. 258–60). The citation of No. 99 as a reference to the eighty silver statues of himself that Augustus converted into an offering to Apollo rests on Grueber's rejection (2.405.79 n. 2) of Babelon's identification (2.47) of the equestrian statue shown on the reverse. Babelon believes that it is a statue of Julius Caesar erected at the time of his apotheosis in 42 B.C. To the reviewer Grueber's argument is unconvincing. In any case, there should be a footnote to warn the reader.

Besides the Introduction (pp. xiii–xvi) and the Commentary (pp. 1–103) a bibliography (pp. 105–11) and an index (pp. 113–17) are given.

MERIWETHER STUART

Hunter College

A Political History of Parthia. By NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE. (The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Pp. xxiii+303. $3.00.

The need of a modern history of Parthia has long been felt. The classic English treatment by George Rawlinson (*The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy* [1873]) has remained a masterpiece of historical writing, superior in some ways to the later German treatments, not only to the brief sketch of Ferdinand Justi (*Geschichte des alten Persiens* [1879], pp. 148–77) but even to the work of Alfred von Gutschmid (*Geschichte Irans* [1888]), which marked in general a notable advance and introduced certain new material, notably that derived from Chinese sources. New evidence, however, especially archeological, numismatic, and epigraphical, was becoming numerous, and the fruitful results which might be expected from a revaluation of Parthian history in modern terms were clearly indicated by the notable studies of W. W. Tarn (especially in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, Vol. IX, chap. xiv) and of M. Rostovtzeff (*ibid.*, Vol. XI, chap. iii; Tarn's monumental *The Greeks in Bactria and India* [1938], is later). The Oriental Institute had already contributed one volume to the history of the Iranian plateau—*The Early History of Iran* (1936) by George G. Cameron. Debevoise' book, an outgrowth of his doctoral dissertation, comes as a promising sequel.

Probably the fairest description of the volume is to call it a sober and painstaking representative of the "old school" of historiography. By choosing the title of "political history," the author wished to free himself from the necessity of dealing with cultural, administrative, or structural aspects of the Parthian state, reserving these for a promised future volume. In the meantime, he makes no pretense of providing an interpretive background for the political events he catalogues. His search for sources has been thorough. All available information bearing on Parthian history has been assembled, and the narrative is a systematic presentation of facts, for the most part in chronological sequence. It is true that he is not very critical as to what constitutes a historical "fact," and in general he seems to regard all sources as of equal authority. Nevertheless there is a utility in his approach, although undoubtedly many of his conclusions will have to be re-examined on the basis of such studies as that of J. Walski, "Quellen zur frühen Geschichte Parthiens," *Eos*, XXXVIII (1937), 492 ff. Footnotes cite the authorities for each statement, with a generous bibliography. (To the bibliography of Trajan's campaign add, however, the excellent study of J. Guey, *Essai sur la guerre parthique de Trajan* [Bibliothèque d'"Istros," Vol. II (1937)].) A full Index makes it possible for the reader to locate readily any topic of discussion and to acquaint himself immediately with the nature of its tradition. The real utility of such a volume is evident, and it will be very useful.

The work suffers, however, from certain regrettable faults. If it has the major virtue of completeness, and completeness it has *κατ' ἄνθρωπον*, it lacks the finish which a book should show. Slips occur, mostly of a minor nature. Trajan's Moorish general Lusius Quietus appears as Lucius, but errors of this type, while awkward, are not capital. Neither is it really important that Debevoise shows a strange indifference to ordinary principles of paragraphing and transition. Here the effect may sometimes be humorous, as when we read on page 84: "Suren was undoubtedly a man of great ability and courage, although not yet thirty years of age. He travelled with a large number of personal attendants, a bodyguard of a thousand mail-clad horsemen, and a sufficient number of concubines to require two hundred wagons" (from Plut. *Crassus* 21, with an unfortunate change in emphasis). In other cases the result is merely to obscure his meaning, as when on page 77 we are not told, but must merely infer, that Gabinius forsook his campaign against Parthia for one against Egypt. Some of this lack of clarity seems to have sprung from a desire for brevity, but much of it suggests rather the lack of a careful revision. It is unfortunate that these rather superficial faults should have been allowed to remain, to discourage the readers that the book otherwise deserves.

Debevoise' reluctance to interpret his narrative is a question of another sort. One would suppose that a reader of Rawlinson, Rostovtzeff, and Tarn could not help interpreting, and recent years have seen the appearance of several brilliant sketches of the Parthian background, notably by C. Huart

(*La Perse antique* [1925], pp. 127–46) and by A. Christensen (*L'Iran sous les Sassanides* [1936], Introduction). Possibly Debevoise is merely preparing the ground for his later study, possibly the book represents an intentional reaction to interpretative historiography. Certainly this matter-of-fact reserve gives a tone of confidence, of verisimilitude, to the narrative. The sources speak for themselves, even if one must feel at times that these would be better for some judicious evaluation. On the other hand, one wonders whether Debevoise ever set himself to ask what was actually happening in Parthia to account for the often rather anomalous and seemingly inconsistent events of its external history. Frequently the reader runs into startling instances of *non sequitur*. Cf. page 135: "As a result of Phraates' victory over Antony, the brewing internal strife in Parthia broke forth." This is, of course, the reverse of the expected; refer for example to the brilliant analysis with which Rawlinson (pp. 360 f.) attempts to explain why the victories of Artabanus over Macrinus did not prevent the rising of the Persians at his back. In many places the implications of the narrative seem not to have been thought through, so that the effect is one of naïveté. The chapter divisions, for example, correspond to no apparent natural divisions in the history; in this respect their, at times, romantic headings are a little misleading. The reader is left at the end feeling that he has been offered the materials for a history, but not the history itself. He has received no explanation of the Parthians, no account of the real factors which maintained the kingdom, torn as it was by civil war and constantly menaced by its neighbors on all sides, to be a strongly resilient, self-conscious power in the Near East for almost five hundred years.

C. BRADFORD WELLES

Yale University

Das sittliche Bewusstsein: Eine Gorgiasanalyse. By WILHELM SCHNEIDEWIN. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1937. Pp. 54. Rm. 2.80.

It is to be hoped that such a work as this will find its appropriate readers; clearly it is intended not for professional scholars but for the edification of laymen. Though the author is tolerably well acquainted with Platonic scholarship in several languages, he disclaims any particular interest in the investigation of Plato's intellectual background and development or in the mutual relations of the several dialogues. After a slight glance at the work of others in these fields, he addresses himself to his chief task, which is (pp. 15–31) the translation or paraphrase of considerable portions of Plato's *Gorgias*, and (pp. 32–54) the elucidation, again chiefly by paraphrase, of nine phases of Socratic thought or method in this dialogue. His style is clear, and his interpretations are sound; I cannot find that he contributes anything of importance that may not be found in the works of Pohlenz and Ritter, or of Taylor and Shorey. With the famous quotation (or misquotation) of Pindar

at *Gorgias* 484*b* he compares (p. 33) Schiller's "Kampf mit dem Drachen," possibly though not certainly to the point. He occasionally illustrates the argument by logical diagrams; apparently he is not familiar with the simpler schemes to be found in the Neoplatonic commentators on Plato. He finds mottoes for parts of his work in writers as diverse as Xenophon, Shakespeare, Bulwer-Lytton, and Dickens. He includes a recent drawing of Socrates in prison.

It would be easy to overlook the real value of Schneidewin's work, which rests not on technical scholarship but on his determination to present those aspects of Plato's thought which are of everlasting significance and power. And since the *Gorgias*, with its grandeur and eloquence and deep feeling, was intended by Plato not to provide material for the activities of later scholars but to move sensitive souls in a perverse world to the understanding and practice of justice, it is well that his voice should now and then be taken seriously. Cynicism and brutality and self-deception have seldom been more impressively confounded by the moral conscience of man than in the *Gorgias*. And these things still matter.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

Harvard University

Olympiodorus, in Platonis Gorgiam commentaria. Edidit WILLIAM NORVIN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1936. Pp. ii+250. Rm. 12.80; geb. Rm. 14.

The Teubner edition of the Commentary of Olympiodorus on Plato's *Phaedo* which Norvin brought out in 1913 is now followed by a companion edition of the Commentary on the *Gorgias*. In the former case Norvin's edition superseded the edition of C. E. Finckh (1847); in the present case it is the edition of Adalbert Jahn (*Arch. f. Philol. u. Paed.*, Vol. XIV [1848]) that is replaced. The former editors had relied on inferior manuscripts, which, like all the other manuscripts of the Commentaries of Olympiodorus, descend from a single Venice manuscript written in the late ninth or early tenth century. This manuscript (Marcianus Graecus 196), which Norvin briefly describes in the Preface of his edition of the Commentary on the *Phaedo*, is his chief authority—almost his only authority—for the text of his editions; indeed, it seldom stands in need of correction. A passage marked as "corrupt" (p. 144, l. 6, θεοῦοιδῃ) might have been corrected, as by W. H. Thompson, in the light of Xenophon (*Memorabilia* i. 6. 10) to read θεοῦ βίον ζῇ. In general, however, Norvin's text is clear and readable. Having had occasion to compare it in many places with Jahn's text, I can bear witness that the improvements are numerous. In typography and arrangement, needless to say, the new edition is a vast improvement.

On Olympiodorus himself modern scholars have too often bestowed either condescension or contempt. His commentaries "unfortunately exhibit no originality, either literary or philosophic," wrote Sandys. Of one of his ob-

servations on the *Gorgias*, W. H. Thompson remarked that it "is worthy of the reputation of Olympiodorus for comparative good sense and insight into his master's meaning. . . . . I say 'comparative'—for Olympiodorus is a Neo-Platonist, and repeats much of the nonsense of his predecessors. But the Greeks, even in their decline, were excellent interpreters."[1] That is nearer the truth of the matter; for Olympiodorus had the knack of writing, or at times of preserving, along with much that is superfluous, really excellent remarks that are the clue to the sense of a passage. Good examples of his remarks, both the illuminating and the banal, are preserved in the Platonic scholia. In a very thorough study of the methods of Neo-Platonic commentators Norvin has claimed even more for Olympiodorus as a contributor to the history of thought.[2] He promises further studies in a future edition of the remaining commentaries. Meanwhile, his editions of the commentaries on the *Phaedo* and the *Gorgias* will enable scholars to appraise for themselves the value of Olympiodorus.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

Harvard University

In Faustum Reiensem studia: commentatio academica. By ARVID G:SON ELG. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1937. Pp. xiv+156.

Why are dissertations written in Latin? Either, if they are not published, as a discipline and test; or, presumably, if they are published, as a means of making known to the nations what the writer has to say. It is an excellent practice. But to his Latin elucidations Mr. Elg thinks it necessary again and again (pp. 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 24, 33, and *passim*) to add a German interpretation, surely a work of supererogation. His monograph, which is competent enough, falls virtually into two parts. The second (cap. ii, "Rhythmica," pp. 53–96, with its eight accompanying statistical tables, pp. 139–50) is the more important and the more original. It is a careful investigation of the *clausula* and *cursus* in Faustus, a native of Brittany, Bishop of Riez (Provence) about 455 (the date of his death is not certain, but is later than 485), and a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris. Elg naturally follows the principles and methods of the Dutch investigator of prose rhythm, De Groot, and in his tabulations he employs De Groot's symbols. So far as I know, no such investigation had previously been made of Faustus, who, like nearly all the prose writers of the Imperial age, was "possessed by the spell" of rhythmical endings. Some distinctions can be made, as Elg shows, between the different works of Faustus in this matter; and criteria laid down which are important for critical, i.e., textual, purposes. Hence he advances to the criticism of the

[1] W. H. Thompson (ed.), *Plato's Gorgias* (London, 1894), p. xii.

[2] *Olympiodoros fra Alexandria og hans Commentar til Platons Phaidon*, af William Norvin (København og Kristiania, 1915); rev. by P. Shorey (*Class. Phil.*, XI [1916], 345–47).

text, which he may claim to have improved in not a few places. And from Faustus he turns to some half-dozen places in Cicero and other writers where the argument from rhythm is valid.

The other half of Elg's little book is of less significance. At times it is positively pedestrian. He writes a number of notes on the use of certain prepositions and other parts of speech, adding examples to those noted before him by Engelbrecht and others, and, here and there, emending the text in accordance with his findings, and winds up with a discussion of *anacoluthon*, *constructio ad sensum*, and attraction of cases. His bibliography ignores the British Academy *Glossaria Latina*, which, admittedly not superseding the *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, yet must be used with it. The late Corpus Professor of Latin was not C. Clark, but A. C. Clark; we all know that, but in the catalogues of our large libraries initials matter, especially of scholars less well known. Holzweissig's revision of Kuehner's *Ausf. Gramm. d. lat. Spr.*, Volume I, to consult which is for a man to take his own life into his hands, is cited on the same footing as Stegmann's revision of Volume II, which is altogether something different; and Liddell and Scott is cited only in the eighth edition of 1897.

But, when all is said, whoever busies himself hereafter with Faustus Reiensis will have to make use of Elg's studies, from which something can also be learned of wider application, e.g. (pp. 4–5), *sibi adrogare* in the sense of "superbire," for, despite *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, "research made easy" is not yet. I am not convinced, however, by Elg's argument (pp. 41 ff.) that *dominus*, *apostolus*, or the like, is to be supplied with *dicit*, *ait*, *inquit*, in quotations from the Bible: these are all simply the equivalent of the English "it says," as Loefstedt has shown. And Elg himself objects to Engelbrecht's emendations, calling for the explicit *dominus*, *apostolus* at several places.

J. Whatmough

Harvard University

Lysias und Athen (*des Redners politische Stellung zum Gaststaat*). By Friedrich Ferckel. Würzburg: Verlag Konrad Triltsch, 1937. Pp. viii+163.

This monograph is a doctoral dissertation written under the direction of Dr. Hildebrecht Hommel. The purpose of this study is to determine whether Lysias lived a life of honest conviction or of shrewd calculation and to compare his words with his deeds.

In general, Lysias is here represented as an unscrupulous opportunist. He helped operate a shield factory during the Peloponnesian War solely for material profit. He supported radical democracy because it insured the prolongation of war profits and offered him his best opportunity of gaining Athenian citizenship. Unlike many other metics, Lysias never bore arms for Athens. He opposed the Thirty because oligarchy blocked the possibility of political advancement for all metics. There is no evidence to show that he risked life and limb with Thrasybulus' band from Phyle and Piraeus; hence, he failed to

gain the coveted reward of citizenship. Subsequent to 403 B.C. Lysias defended oligarchs and accused democrats indiscriminately in his speeches, thus showing that he had no deep-seated political convictions. He did not champion the cause of the metics as a class. He violated the letter of the amnesty rarely, the spirit frequently. Lysias' acts do not square with his words.

The author of this monograph has sifted all the ancient and modern material on Lysias with care and discernment. He gives due credit to American scholars, notably Bonner, Calhoun, and Lofberg. In a study so richly documented it may be permissible to mention one omission, that of Luebbert's dissertation *De amnestia*, published in 1881 in Kiel. This omission stands out, owing to frequent references to Grosser's older (1868) and inferior monograph on the amnesty of 403 B.C. Another criticism has to do with an apparent contradiction: on page 23 the author seems to imply that there was only one Board of Ten after the overthrow of the Thirty, while on page 36 he speaks clearly of two such bodies.

This fine study reflects credit not only on Dr. Ferckel but also on Dozent Hommel, who inspired and directed the work. The latter is unquestionably one of the foremost authorities in the field of legal antiquities today. More than a decade ago his publication of *Heliaia* (see my review in *Classical Philology*, XXVI, 443 f.) stamped him as a scholar of the first rank, and his subsequent contributions have confirmed the correctness of this high opinion. In this dissertation many fine qualities of the teacher are reflected in the work of his student.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

History of Ancient Civilization, Vol. II: *The Roman World*. By ALBERT A. TREVER. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1939. Pp. xvii+817.

The second volume of this history parallels the first in general plan and format. Cross-references to the first volume reduce repetition to a minimum and should help the reader to associate contemporaneous developments in the Greek and Roman worlds. Geography, the sources for early Roman history, primitive Italy, and the regal period in Rome occupy thirty-two pages; this section shows less assimilation of the excellent recent studies cited in the Bibliography than the rest of the book does. About three hundred pages are assigned to the republic and over four hundred and fifty to the empire, so that there is ample room for discussion of economic and social developments and for a survey of the provinces in the early empire. Since this is the case, one regrets the scanty attention given to Parthia, which is mentioned chiefly in connection with individual Roman campaigns. On the other hand, Jewish history and the rise of Christianity are narrated in fuller detail than one often finds in a general history of Rome. The chronological survey ends with the reign of Constantine, although some later events are mentioned in connection with the discussion of the decline of the Roman Empire.

The many references to Latin and Greek sources and to recent studies of Roman history are a valuable feature, as are the ample bibliographies. Comparatively few, however, of the important periodical articles that have appeared in recent years are listed.

The classical student will find in this textbook a historical narrative well suited to his needs and conveniently arranged for reference in his studies of Latin literature and civilization. The lavish use of Latin terms should also be of value to classical students but may seem an unnecessary burden to others, though Latin words and phrases are usually clearly defined. Trever's book is more diffuse and less incisive than Cary's *History of Rome*, its closest parallel in length and scope. Trever deals more fully with general social and cultural matters and with the provinces, but Cary's work is likely to prove more useful as a basis for study of political and administrative questions.

Eva Matthews Sanford

Sweet Briar College

Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae. Recensuit Gilbertus Murray. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. $2.50.

Of the major Greek authors there is perhaps none other whose text falls so far short of reaching a definitive edition as Aeschylus'. Though that goal, therefore, needs must lie far in the future, Murray's work marks a considerable progress in that direction. Thanks to numerous emendations, by the editor himself as well as by others, and especially to improved punctuation, Aeschylus will be somewhat easier to read and interpret than he has been hitherto. The critical notes are unusually complete and will be highly useful to scholars. At verse 146 γάνος, which was conjectured by Vitelli and has recently been suggested by Schönberger as if new, might have been listed (cf. *Philol. Woch.*, LVII [1937], 1168 and 1408).

A commendable feature is the inclusion of supplementary material such as the ancient Αἰσχύλου βίος, Κατάλογος τῶν Αἰσχύλου δραμάτων, and several fragments, including the portion of an epigram unearthed in the Athenian ἀγορά as recently as 1933. It would be a great convenience if editors could see their way clear to incorporating the scholia in their editions, but perhaps that would be too much to expect.

A tinge of irony is cast over this edition by Professor Murray's own words in a recent review of the Headlam-Thomson *Oresteia* (*Class. Rev.*, LIII [1939], 10 f.): "Aeschylus has no doubt suffered from over-editing and over-emending. Compared with other authors he has enjoyed a series of editors who were almost invariably brilliant, but, alas, at the same time eccentric, and neither quality has shown signs of diminishing in recent years!"

Roy C. Flickinger

State University of Iowa

Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome (50 B.C.–200 A.D.). By HELEN JEFFERSON LOANE. ("Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science," Ser. LVI, No. 2.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 158. $1.50.

The monograph under review makes two distinct contributions to the study of Roman economic history. In the first place the author presents, with stated limitations, a complete synthesis of epigraphical, literary, and archeological evidence under the headings, "Imports," "Industry," and "Distribution." The striking omission of "Exports" from the list—an omission forced by lack of evidence—is in itself an indication of the profound difference between Rome and any other capital of human history. The wealth of material concerning importations, on the other hand, has limited the presentation to "only the chief articles of trade and the most important sources of supply." Within these limits, the presentation is complete and well documented.

The second contribution lies in the conclusions of the author. Certain rather shopworn hypotheses have been discarded and replaced with a supply of 1938 models. The older thesis that slave-manned factories must have been the rule is banished. A relatively large concentration of labor occurred, for example, in baking, fulling, and tanning, but Loane's conclusion is that large-scale production was the exception. Her summary approximates a barrister's defense of a client economically blind. An important footnote on page 54 (cf. p. 100, n. 146; p. 130, n. 66) discusses the possibility of receipt, in Rome, of tribute in kind other than grain. A concise description of Trajan's *Mercato* (pp. 118–20) also brings the state close to the businessmen of Rome. Again the author's interesting speculations as to the *horrea piperataria* (attributed to Vespasian) carry one far beyond the usual explanation of imperial benevolence toward retail merchants. There were efforts by some emperors to maintain fair prices for producers and consumers. But protracted state interference in trade and industry, along lines either of regimentation or of competition, is definitely relegated to the third century.

J. J. VAN NOSTRAND

University of California

Classica et Mediaevalia: revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire, Vol. I. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1938. Pp. 283.

Altogether welcome is this new and attractively printed journal edited by William Norvin. It announces as its field the study of classical antiquity and of classical tradition in the Middle Ages in the fields of history, law, church history, languages and literatures generally, and philosophy. Archeology, history of art, and general linguistics are not to be included. Articles will be printed in English, French, or German. The introductory essay on the aims of this new journal makes a very favorable impression, and the contributions, so far as I am able to judge them, confirm that impression. A. Afzelius, "Zur

Definition der römischen Nobilität in der Zeit Ciceros," examines (pp. 40–94) Gelzer's definition of *nobilitas*. The essay is interesting as an example of method, for Afzelius traces back the error which he seeks to correct to an unsupported dictum of the Italian humanist Carlo Sigonio (1560). L. L. Hammerich offers useful historical notes on the "Visiones Georgii. Visiones quas in Purgatorio S. Patricii vidit Georgius miles de Ungaria A.D. MCCCLIII," a work which he had edited some years ago. Henry A. Steen collects the epistolary formulas in Greek papyri (pp. 119–76). Inger M. Boberg classifies the folk tales akin to Apuleius' Cupid and Psyche and exemplifies successfully the light which modern tradition throws on classical story. The last articles are Blatt's "Remarques sur l'histoire des traductions latines" (pp. 217–42), a commentary on the early medieval translators and translations and particularly on the *Vivarium* of Cassiodorus, and Benediktsson's edition (pp. 243–80) of an early Byzantine biblical lexicon which is usually known by the name Stephanos. As is evident, these articles appeal to many interests, and those which are announced for the forthcoming issues show that the editors have cast their net wide. They are to deal with such subjects as the perfect in classical Latin, incest in Germanic law, and the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas.

Archer Taylor

University of Chicago

Hur Rom byggdes under antiken. By Axel Boëthius. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Forlag, 1938. Pp. 373. Kr. 7.50; bound, kr. 9.00.

The purpose of this notice is merely to call attention to a work, so far accessible only in Swedish, that is unusually stimulating and valuable for students of Roman archeology, history, and literature. It combines an account of Roman architecture, art, and topography with a historical sketch of the development of the city. Thus it becomes a contribution also to social history and gives a clearer picture of the nature of the city and living conditions in it at various periods than any other work known to the reviewer. A few plans and many well-chosen illustrations are included in the 149 figures inserted in the text, while two larger plans, one of Rome and one of the Forum, are placed at the end of the volume. There are short bibliographical accounts for the various chapters, but the author states that it was impossible to include the detailed references to literature and the discussion desirable as a justification for his interpretations. It is to be hoped that an English version, with this material added, will be prepared. It is scarcely necessary to say that it would be welcomed by the many who know the high standards of the author's work and his unusual qualifications for the task. The present reviewer cannot discuss the technical problems involved but can testify that the book is written clearly in an excellent style readily understood by the average student or general reader but that it also contains much of great interest to the scholar.

J. A. O. Larsen

University of Chicago

The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Compiled and edited by SIR PAUL HARVEY. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. xii+468; plates and maps. $3.00.

This useful *Companion* has been prepared to give the lay reader in a single, comprehensive volume the elementary facts of Greek and Roman literature and the historical background necessary for its interpretation. Appropriate classical allusions in English literature are frequently cited also. An excellent feature of the book is the clear indication of the ordinary English pronunciation of names in head-words, although in the Preliminary Note explaining the scheme adopted there is an unfortunate identification of length of vowel with that of syllable. There are naturally some errors of fact and inconsistencies (e.g., the illogical chronology of Aristotle's movements after Plato's death as outlined, *s.v.* "Aristotle," p. 44; the dating of Middle Minoan III at 2400 B.C., *s.v.* "Crete," p. 124 [but cf. *s.v.* "Minoan," p. 275]; the reference to the birth of Attic tragedy as occurring in the fifth century, *s.v.* "Texts and Studies," p. 417; the apparent confusion of Lucius Varius with Alfenus Varus in the article on Virgil, p. 447), but these as well as typographical blemishes should be corrected in a second edition. Larger type and wider margins would enhance the appearance of the printed page.

EDGAR C. REINKE

Alabama College

Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres. Iterum edidit FRIDERICUS WALTHARIUS LENZ. Leipzig: B. G Teubner, 1937. Rm. 3.60.

The first edition of the Tibullus of Lenz (Levy) was reviewed in *Classical Philology*, XXIII (1928), 299. The new edition was undertaken with reluctance by Lenz, who felt that he could not produce a really good apparatus or restore the ancient text.

The chief change in the new edition is due to the utilization of my article on the *florilegia* (*Class. Phil.*, XXIII [1928], 128). The Introduction summarizes the material in some six pages and adds a three-page table to show at a glance what lines occur in the various *florilegia.* The apparatus includes many readings from my article—perhaps too many, in view of their unimportance.

The apparatus has been simplified and improved, but, apart from the *florilegia* readings, no new manuscript material is included.

B. L. ULLMAN

BOOKS RECEIVED

ALBERTELLI, PILO (ed.). *Gli Eleati: testimonianze e frammenti.* Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1939. Pp. 250. L. 30.

Die Antike: Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur des klassischen Altertums, Band XV, Hefte 1 and 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1939.

ATKINSON, K. M. T. *Athenian Legislative Procedure and Revision of Laws.* (Reprint from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Vol. XXIII, No. 1, April, 1939.) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939. Pp. 46. 2*s*.

———. *Two Tomb-Groups from Selinus.* (Reprint from *Papers of the British School at Rome,* XIV [1938], 115–36.)

BEEDE, GRACE LUCILE. *Vergil and Aratus: A Study in the Art of Translation.* (Dissertation, University of Chicago.) Private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Ill., 1936. Pp. iii+90.

BLOCH, HERBERT. *I Bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana: contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana.* 3 vols. Roma: Carlo Colombo, 1938–39. Pp. 353.

BONNER, S. F. *The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: A Study in the Development of Critical Method.* ("Cambridge Classical Studies," Vol. V.) Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. vii+108. $2.00.

BOTSFORD, GEORGE WILLIS, AND ROBINSON, CHARLES ALEXANDER, JR. *Hellenic History.* Revised and re-written by CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. xiv+398. $4.50.

BUCHWALD, WOLFGANG. *Studien zur Chronologie der attischen Tragödie 455 bis 431.* (Dissertation, Königsberg.) Weida i. Thür.: Thomas & Hubert, 1939. Pp. 58.

BUTLER, H. E., and SCULLARD, H. H. (eds.). *Livy, Book XXX.* London: Methuen & Co., 1939. Pp. x+176+1 map+3 plans. 3/9.

CALDER, W. M., and KEIL, JOSEF (eds.). *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939. Pp. xx+382. 25/– net.

CARCOPINO, JÉRÔME. *La Vie quotidienne à Rome à l'apogée de l'empire.* Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1939. Pp. 348. 25 fr.

CARMODY, FRANCIS J. *Physiologus latinus: éditions préliminaires. Versio B.* Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 63.

Classica et Mediaevalia: revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire, Vol. II, Fasc. 1. Copenhagen: Librairie Gyldendal, 1939.

Collectanea Schrijnen. Verspreide Opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen. Nijmegen and Utrecht: S. A. Dekker & Van de Vegt N. V., 1939. Pp. xx+496. Fl. 6.

Conference Augustee nel bimillenario della nascita. ("Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore," Serie V, Vol. XVII.) Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1939. Pp. 282. L. 25.

COSMAN, ARNOLD CAREL (ed.). *Demosthenes' Rede tegen Zenothemis (Oratie XXXII) mit Inleiding en Commentaar.* Leiden: Burgersdijk & Niermans (Templum Salomonis), 1939. Pp. 197.

CRAWFORD, D. S. *Greek and Latin: An Introduction to the Historical Study of the Classical Languages.* Cairo: Fouad I University; Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1939. Pp. 331.

DALY, LLOYD WILLIAM, AND SUCHIER, WALTHER. *Altercatio Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti philosophi.* ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXIV, Nos. 1-2.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press. Pp. 168. $2.00.

DEFERRARI, R. J.; BARRY, SISTER M. INVIOLATA; AND MCGUIRE, M. R. P. *A Concordance of Ovid.* Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Pp. ix+2,220. $20.00.

DELCOURT, MARIE. *Stérilités mystérieuses & naissances maléfiques dans l'antiquité classique.* ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. 83.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres; Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1938. Pp. 113. 35 fr.

DENNISTON, J. D. (ed.). *Euripides: Electra.* Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xliv+226. $2.75.

DOVER, K. J. (trans.). *Racine's "Phèdre," Act I, Scene i, Lines 1-113, Translated into Greek.* ("Gaisford Prize for Greek Verse," 1939.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. 7. 2*s*. 6*d*.

ELLIS, LOWELL B.; MATHEWS, A. J.; AND STARR, WILLIAM T. *Three Studies in Philology.* (University of Oregon Monographs, "Studies in Literature and Philology," No. 1.) Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon Press, 1939. Pp. 19. $0.25.

ERIKSON, ALVAR (ed.). *Sancti Epiphanii episcopi interpretatio evangeliorum.* ("Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund," Vol. XXVII.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup; London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi+182.

———. *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum.* Lund: H. Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1939. Pp. xvi+147.

FOX, SISTER MARGARET MARY. *The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great as Revealed in His Works.* ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LVII.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Pp. xvi+172. $2.00.

FRANÇON, MARCEL. *Notes sur l'esthétique de la femme au XVI^e siècle.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. 195.

HAARHOFF, T. J. *The Stranger at the Gate: Aspects of Exclusiveness and Co-operation in Ancient Greece and Rome, with Some Reference to Modern Times.* London, New York, and Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1938. Pp. xii+354. $5.00.

HARRISON, THOMAS PERRIN, JR. (ed.). *The Pastoral Elegy: An Anthology, Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Notes.* English Translations by HARRY JOSHUA LEON. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1939. Pp. xi+312. $2.50.

HAVELOCK, E. A. *The Lyric Genius of Catullus.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. xii+198. 8/6.

HEATON, JOHN WESLEY. *Mob Violence in the Late Roman Republic, 133-49* B.C. ("Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences," Vol. XXIII, No. 4.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp. 107. $1.50.

Hermathena, No. LIII (May, 1939). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939. 3*s*.

HOLMBERG, ERIK J. *Excavations at Asea in Arcadia 1936–1938: Preliminary Report.* ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," XLV, 1939: 3.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag, 1939. Pp. 30+15 pls.+1 map. Kr. 6.

HUBAUX, JEAN, AND LEROY, MAXIME. *Le Mythe du phénix dans les littératures grecque et latine.* ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. 82.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres; Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. Pp. xxxvi+267. 90 fr.

JAEGER, WERNER. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture.* Translated from the 2d German ed. by GILBERT HIGHET. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. xxxii+420. 15/– net.

JOHNSON, ROZELLE PARKER. *Compositiones variae, from Codex 490, Biblioteca Capitolare, Lucca, Italy: An Introductory Study.* ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXIII, No. 3.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp. 116. $1.50.

KNIGHT, W. F. JACKSON. *Accentual Symmetry in Vergil.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. x+107. 6/- net.

LEVI, ADOLFO. *I Miti platonici sull'anima e sui suoi destini.* Lodi (Milano): G. Biancardi, 1939. Pp. 32.

LOWE, E. A. (ed.). *Codices Latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century,* Part III: *Italy: Ancona-Novara.* Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. $24.00.

MCPEEK, JAMES A. S. *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain.* ("Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature," Vol. XV.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii+411.

MERKX, P. A. H. J. *Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian.* ("Latinitas Christianorum primaeva: studia ad sermonem Latinum Christianum pertinentia," Fasc. 9.) Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N. V., 1939. Pp. xv+141. Fl. 3.60.

MERLAN, PHILIPP. *Platons Form der philosophischen Mitteilung.* ("Hermaion," Fasc. 10.) Leopoli: Philomatha, 1939. Pp. 25. 2 fr. Helv.

Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua, Vol. VI: *Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria.* Edited by W. H. BUCKLER and W. M. CALDER. ("Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor.") Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939. Pp. xxii+166+73 pls. £ 2.

NISBET, ROBERT G. (ed.). *M. Tulli Ciceronis de domo sua ad pontifices oratio.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xliv+232. $3.00.

PEARSON, LIONEL. *Early Ionian Historians.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. viii+240. $5.00.

PEETERS, FÉLIX. *Les "Fastes" d'Ovide: histoire du texte.* Bruxelles: Librairie Falk Fils, 1939. Pp. 514. 20 belgas.

PIERCY, JOSEPHINE K. *Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth Century America (1607–1710).* In two parts. ("Yale Studies in English," Vol. XCI.) New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1939. Pp. xiii+360. $3.50.

PRENTICE, E. PARMALEE. *Hunger and History: The Influence of Hunger on Human History.* New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1939. Pp. xviii+269.

ROSTAGNI, AUGUSTO. *La Letteratura di Roma repubblicana ed Augustea.* (Istituto di Studi Romani, "Storia di Roma," Vol. XXIV.) Bologna: Licinio Capelli Editore, 1939. Pp. 514. L. 55.

ROUSSEL, PIERRE. *Sparte.* Paris: E. de Boccard, 1939. Pp. 219.

SCHLÄPFER, P. LOTHAR. *Untersuchungen zu den attischen Staatsurkunden und den Amphiktyonenbeschlüssen der Demosthenischen Kranzrede.* ("Rhetorische Studien," Heft 21.) Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1939. Pp. 246. Rm. 12.

SHAW, CHANDLER. *Etruscan Perugia.* ("Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology," No. 28.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. xiii+102+16 plates. $2.75.

SIMETERRE, RAYMOND. *La Théorie socratique de la vertu-science selon les "Mémorables" de Xénophon.* ("Textes et études d'histoire de la philosophie," Tome I, Fasc. 1.) Paris: Pierre Téqui, 1938. Pp. 79. 15 fr.; abroad, 17 fr. 70.

STEVENSON, G. H. *Roman Provincial Administration till the Age of the Antonines.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. viii+182+1 map. 7/6.

WEBSTER, T. B. L. *Greek Art and Literature, 530–400* B.C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xx+218+24 pls. $5.00.

WHITE, H. G. EVELYN, AND OLIVER, JAMES H. *The Temple of Hibis in El Khārgeh Oasis,* Part II: *Greek Inscriptions.* ("Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition Publications," Vol. XIV.) New York, 1938. Pp. xiii+71+13 pls. $3.50.

WIJNBERG, SIMON (ed.). *Antiphon's eerste Rede met Vertaling en Commentaar.* (Dissertation, Groningen.) Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1938. Pp. 162.

WINSPEAR, ALBAN D., AND SILVERBERG, TOM. *Who Was Socrates?* New York: Cordon Co., 1939. Pp. 96. $1.25.

YOUNG, RODNEY S. *Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora* With an Appendix on the Skeletal Remains: *Geometric Athenians,* by J. LAWRENCE ANGEL. ("Hesperia, "Suppl. II.) Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1939. Pp. ix+250.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIV